HISTORY AND CONTEMPLATION. THE DIMENSIONS OF THE RESTORATION OF MAN IN TWO TREATISES ON THE ARK OF NOAH BY HUGH OF ST. VICTOR

by

Grover A. Zinn, Jr.

Department of Religion

Date: 27 Sept 1968

Approved:

RCPetry
Ray C. Petry, Supervisor

Frank Baker

Stuart C. Henry

Egil Grislis

Charles R. Young

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in the Department of Religion
in the Graduate School of Arts and
Sciences of Duke University

1968

ABSTRACT

(Religion-Church History)

HISTORY AND CONTEMPLATION. THE DIMENSIONS OF THE RESTORATION OF MAN IN TWO TREATISES ON THE ARK OF NOAH BY HUGH OF ST. VICTOR

by

Grover A. Zinn, Jr.

Department of Religion
Duke University

Date: 27 Sept, 1968

Approved:

Ray C. Petry, Supervisor

Frank Baker

Egil Grislis

Stuart C. Henry

Charles R. Young

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in the Department of Religion
in the Graduate School of Arts and
Sciences of Duke University

1968

Tr.R.
Ph.D.
Z78H
1969

ABSTRACT

(Religion-Church History)

HISTORY AND CONTEMPLATION. THE DIMENSIONS OF THE RESTORATION OF MAN IN TWO TREATISES ON THE ARK OF NOAH BY HUGH OF ST. VICTOR

by

Grover A. Zinn, Jr.

In the twelfth century the Parisian Abbey of St. Victor provided an atmosphere which nurtured both scholarship and the contemplative life in a manner indicating the potential of the Canons Regular. Hugh of St. Victor was largely responsible for defining the Victorine spirit. He combined the even-tempered yet avid intellectual curiosity, the contemplative longing, and the concern for Biblical history which characterized the Victorine tradition.

It is clear that Hugh was both a conservative and an innovator. Grounded in Patristic erudition he gladly accepted what he saw of value in the twelfth-century monastic and scholastic milieu. As a Canon Regular he sought to mediate between two diverging attitudes, and he must always be understood in this light.

This work explores the interaction between the sense of history and contemplative aspiration in Hugh's thought. Two treatises with the Ark of

Noah as their subject form the basis for this study. They are *De arca Noe morali* and *De arca Noe mystica*. Rightly classed among Hugh's mystical writings they present the fundamental attitude toward history which informs Hugh's thought.

With a Biblical theme as subject and a monastic *collatio* as the context of presentation these treatises direct attention to the traditions of Biblical *lectio* and the contemplative life. Hugh effected a revolution in Biblical studies, emphasizing the foundation of history, conceived as a *narratio rerum gestorum*, as preparation for further exegesis and theological reflection. In light of Patristic exegesis, later developments, and the contemporary situation Hugh's forceful affirmation of history is seen as a counter to developments of Carolingian allegory and to the non-historical attitude in the schools. A consideration of significant texts and Victorine liturgical life suggests the liturgy was an important factor in nurturing Hugh's sense of history and his equal sensitivity to the spiritual meaning of that history.

The Ark treatises presuppose a drawing which no longer exists, except in *De arca Noe mystica*. This iconograph had numerous elements, the chief being a sketch of the Ark and a figure of Christ in glory. The structure and content of this iconograph reveal Hugh's idea of the correlation between temporal events and the contemplative ascent as reflected in the horizontal and vertical elements of the Ark. The presence of the figure of Christ is seen to be integrally related to the interpretation of the Ark in a Christological context.

A new interpretation of the relation of the drawing to the literal exegesis of the Noachic material shows Hugh's adherence to the letter in his exegesis and his freedom when utilizing the structure of the Ark as a vehicle for meditative reflection. The primacy of history emerges in the allegorical interpretation of the Ark for the Church is seen as the dynamic community of faithful men developing through all ages, rather than a static, hierarchical institution.

The Ark treatises present early and forceful statements of Hugh's conception of the contemplative experience, the two-fold punishment of ignorance and concupiscence in the Fall, and the category of the works of creation and restoration. A sacramental understanding of the world and of history is basic to Hugh's thought and develops in correlation with an understanding of man as conditioned by the Fall and bereft of an inner sense of spiritual matters. History is a new mode of God's presence via the Incarnation and the sacraments, calling man to return within himself.

Hugh's use of traditional "house-texts" associated with the contemplative life brings a new element into the Ark interpretation, which also involves the historical matrix of the work of restoration. The stability of the Ark derives from the temporal work of restoration which initiate man's return to God, while the Flood is seen as the chaos of time and existence apart from these works.

A fresh examination of the contemplative ascent in the Ark treatises reveals the presence of the Dionysian theme of purification, illumination, and union. Hugh significantly modifies the cosmic and noetic emphases of Denys with psychological, ascetic, and historical motifs derived from Augustinian principles and the Western contemplative tradition. Hugh again provides a point of transition and a new departure. He represents a profound and personal correlation of themes of historical development, eschatological consciousness, and contemplative desire in a liturgical setting.

To

Mary Mel

and

Jennifer Anne

and to my parents,

Mr. and Mrs. Grover A. Zinn

PREFACE

This work owes much in its inspiration to Professor Ray C. Petry. It was he who introduced me to the Victorines. I shall always remain grateful for his guidance and assistance in my work and for the wise counsel which he rendered. His penetrating insight into the life of the Middle Ages and his grasp of the subtleties of the contemplative life and tradition have often thrown new light on familiar situations.

The debts incurred in the process of research and writing are almost too numerous to mention. My indebtedness to those men who have studied the Victorine community and its members is evident on the pages which follow. Without the gracious assistance of many librarians this work would have been impossible. The libraries of Duke University and Oberlin College have provided materials and have sought elsewhere for those not at hand. Mr. Donn Michael Farris, a librarian without peer, has been most generous in making books available at crucial periods. The typists who have labored on the manuscript have been both patient and proficient.

It is my wife, Mary Mel, who has, more than anyone else, made this work possible. Her love and support have been a constant encouragement. Her labors in reading proofs and the many other little details calling for her attention made writing much easier.

The author would like to express his appreciation to Duke University for financial assistance during his graduate studies and to the Board of Higher Education of the Methodist Church for a Dempster Fellowship. The typing of this manuscript has been generously supported by a grant from Oberlin College.

Finally, to all of those, known or unknown, who have assisted in some way with this thesis I express my gratitude.

ABBREVIATIONS

Works by Hugh of St. Victor

A. morl.	*De arca Noe morali*
A. myst.	*De arca Noe mystica*
Did.	*Didascalicon*
DS	*De sacramentis christianae fidei*
DSNSL	*De sacramentis naturae et scriptai legi*
DSSS	*De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris*
DVM	*De vanitate mundi*
IHC	*Commentaria in hierarchiam coelestam*

Periodicals and Series

AHDLMA	*Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*
BGPTMA	*Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des mittelalters*
MPL	*Patrologia latina*
RHE	*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*
RMAL	*Revue du moyen âge latin*
RSPT	*Revue des sciences philosophies et théologiques*
RechSR	*Recherches de science religieuse*
RSR	*Revue des sciences religieuses*
RTAM	*Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

PREFACE viii

ABBREVIATIONS x

INTRODUCTION 2

I. HISTORY, EXEGESIS, AND THE LITURGY 38

II. THE ARK OF NOAH 117

III. THE THEOLOGICAL SETTING FOR THE CONTEMPLATIVE LIFE 192

IV. HISTORY AND CONTEMPLATION 267

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

HISTORY AND CONTEMPLATION. THE DIMENSIONS OF THE RESTORATION OF MAN IN TWO TREATISES ON THE ARK OF NOAH BY HUGH OF ST. VICTOR

INTRODUCTION

Hugh of St. Victor lived in a time of transition and change. As urban centers developed and new currents of intellectual life stirred, the early twelfth century saw the awakening of the slumbering spirit of Europe.[1] In matters of religion two movements laid fair claim to be regarded as the focal points of vitality. One was the wave of ecclesiastical renewal which found particular expression in the reinvigoration of the Benedictine Order while giving strong impetus both for the foundation of new monastic centers such as Citeaux and Clairvaux and for the rise of the Canons Regular.[2] The other focus of energy was the growth of the cathedral schools in the urban centers, especially in France.[1] These two currents, which represented two diverging ideals, could not long avoid conflict.[2] Peter Abelard and St. Bernard were exemplars of the claims of the *scholares* and the *claustrales* respectively, and their conflict with all of its exaggerations reflected the tension of the day.[3]

---

[1] For basic orientation, cf. C. H. Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1927). Generally useful is Andre Forest, F. van Steenberghen, and M. de Gandillac, *Le mouvement doctrinal du XI^{e} au XIV^{e} siècle*, Vol. XIII of *Histoire de l'Église depuis les origines jusqu'a nos jours*, ed. A. Fliche and V. Martin (26 vols.; Paris, 1951). Cited hereafter as Forest, *Le mouvement doctrinal*. Of particular significance is the collection of essays by M.-D. Chenu, *La théologie au douzième siècle* ("Etudes de philosophie medievale," Vol. XLV; Paris, 1957). Cited hereafter as Chenu, *TDS*.

[2] Cf. the excellent study in J. Leclercq, F. Vandenbroucke, and L. Bouyer, *La spiritualité du moyen âge*, Vol. II of *Histoire de la spiritualité chrétienne*, ed. L. Bouyer, *et al*. Cf. pp. 123-272. Cited hereafter as Leclercq, *La spiritualité*. Also cf. J. Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*, trans. C. Misrahi (New York, 1961), p. 192: "We must recognize an established sociological fact: the existence in the Middle Ages of at least two different milieus where Christian reflection was operative--the town schools and the monasteries." Leclercq wisely adds: "'At least two' so that the question of the canons regular, especially those of the school of Saint-Victor, could be reserved for the specialists." Cf. p. 316, no. 10. Cited hereafter as Leclercq, *LLDG*.

In the midst of the contest between these two ideals of the Christian life a center of mediation sprang up at Paris in the form of the group of Canons Regular at the Abbey of St. Victor.[4] During the early period of the Abbey's existence Hugh of St. Victor waged a brilliant yet losing battle to reconcile the claims of reason and the spirit, of the *scholares* and the *claustrales*. In the words of Beryl Smalley, Hugh, as a Canon Regular, "courageously refused to admit the dilemma" between the cloister and the classroom.[1] He knew the difference, and he marked it well. Yet he also saw a vital connection which needed to be established and maintained between the ancient monastic *lectio divina* and the "questioning" spirit of nascent scholasticism.[2]

---

[1] For the schools--urban, monastic, and Canons Regular--cf. G. Pare, A. Brunet, and P. Tremblay, *La renaissance du XII^{e} siècle: Les écoles et* l'enseignement ("Publications de l'Institut d'Études Medievales d'Ottawa," Vol. III; Paris-Ottawa, 1933). Cited hereafter as Paré, *et al*, *La renaissance*. More recently, cf. Ph. Delhaye, "L'organisation scolaire au XII^{e} siècle," *Traditio*, V (1947), 211-68. Also, cf. J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique du XII^{e} siècle* (2nd ed. aug.; "Museum Lessianum," Section historique, No. 10; Bruges, 1948). Cited hereafter as de Ghellinck, *MT*. Cf. H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, new edn. by F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden (Oxford, 1936).

[2] The differences are sketched well in Delhaye, "L'organisation," pp. 213-17 and 225-38, and Leclercq, *LLDG*, chap. ix.

[3] Cf. Watkin Williams, *Saint Bernard of Clairvaux* ("Publications of the University of Manchester," Historical series No. LXIX; Manchester, 1935), esp. 289ff. on the conflict. Also, de Ghellinck, *MT*, pp. 149 ff.; Delhaye, "L'organisation," pp. 255 ff. who traces Abelard's teaching career; and Paré, *et al*, *La renaissance*, pp. 275 ff.

[4] The only recent history of the Abbey is that by Fourier Bonnard, *Histoire de l'Abbaye royale et de l'Ordre des Chanoines réguliers de St-Victor de Paris* (2 vols.; Paris, 1905-1907). Cited hereafter as Bonnard, *Histoire*, with the understanding refs. are to vol. I.

Little if anything can be said with certainty about Hugh's life.[3] The brother who attended him in his last hours left a letter.[4] That is the only contemporary or near-contemporary biographical record of unquestioned verity. Other information comes from remarks by later chroniclers or manuscript copyists; from the Victorine Necrology and *Ordo*; and from certain very elusive bits of evidence in Hugh's *Didascalicon* and the covering letter sent with *De arrha animae* to the Canons Regular of St. Pancras, Hammerleben.[5]

---

[1] *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (2nd ed. rev.; Oxford, 1952), p. 83. Cited hereafter as Smalley, *SBMA*.

[2] On the history of attempts to define "scholasticism" cf. M. de Wulf, *History of Mediaeval Philosophy*, trans, E. C. Messenger (2 vols.; 3d English ed., based on 6th French ed.; London, 1935.), pp. 5-20, and the comments of M.-D. Chenu, *Toward Understanding St. Thomas*, trans. with authorized corrections and bibliographical additions by A.-M. Landry and D. Hughes (Chicago, 1964), pp. 58-69.

[3] The same is true of the life of Richard of St. Victor. Cf. G. Dumeige, *Richard de Saint-Victor et l'idée chrétienne de l'amour* (Paris, 1952), p. 166: "We are ignorant concerning the date of Richard's birth as well as the date of his arrival at the Abbey."

[4] This letter, by one Osbert, is found trans. in Flavien Hugonin, *Essai sur la fondation de l'école de Saint-Victor de Paris*, MPL 175:xv-xcix, cf. esp. cols. xlvii-xlix. Latin text in MPL 175:clxi-clxiii.

[5] For a clear resume of the pertinent data, cf. Jerome Taylor, *The Origin and Early Life of Hugh of St. Victor: An Evaluation of the Tradition* ("Texts and Studies in the History of Mediaeval Education," No. V; Notre Dame, 1957). Cited hereafter as Taylor, *Origin*.

The place of Hugh's birth has been a subject of recent debate. Two places of origin have been proposed. Hugh was either a German from Saxony or a Fleming from the vicinity of Ypres. The Flemish theory has been supported by Mabillon, F. E. Croydon,[1] and more recently by R. Baron.[2] Until the work of Croydon the accepted view that Hugh was born in Saxony, of the family of the Counts of Blankenburg, entered St. Pancras at Hammersleben as a youth, and came to St. Victor accompanied by his uncle.[3] This view was established by an eighteenth-century doctoral dissertation, and recently Jerome Taylor has again reasserted the validity of the Saxon tradition.[4] Meanwhile Baron has supported Croydon in affirming Hugh's birth in the Low Countries.[5] Baron, like F. Vernet

---

1. "Notes on the Life of Hugh of St. Victor," The Journal of Theological Studies, XL (1939), 232-53. Croydon concludes that the theory of Saxon origin is a "structure of fancy and conjecture" erected on the basis of the letter to Hammersleben. Even if this letter is accepted (and Croydon does not) as supporting the Saxon theory, Hugh ought not to be called a count of Blankenburg. Overall, the early evidence, is for an origin in the Low Countries or Lorraine, says Croydon.

2. "Notes biographiques sur Hugues de Saint-Victor," RHE, LI (1956), 920-34.

3. Cf. the overly enthusiastic and effusive statement of the tradition by Hugonin, Essai, MPL 175:xli-xlvi.

4. Cf. the summary of the argument and Taylor's own argument in his Origin.

5. Cf. Baron, "Notes biographiques," pp. 930-32 (summary).

earlier,[1] has a mediating solution to offer, however. He proposes that Hugh was born in the Low Countries, went to Hammersleben as a youth and finally made his way to Paris.[2] Whether this is gratuitous conflation or accurate deduction remains to be seen.

The problem of the place of Hugh's birth and early life will no doubt remain a disputed point in the future. The two latest studies, by Taylor and Baron, have brought forth no new evidence, yet they differ on the basic fact in question. The fact is that each man has brought preconceptions to the task and has "crystallized" texts and probabilities around his own point of view, in order to make a case.[3]

This debate over Hugh's origins would be of use if it were possible to establish a definitive influence upon him during his early years. Heretofore such attempts have failed. German scholars have claimed Hugh as a representative of a particularly "Germanic" outlook, characterized as "deutscher Symbolismus," as opposed to the rationalism of such "Frenchmen" as Abelard. In claiming this German scholars have used the Saxon origin of Hugh to argue that like other "Germanic" writers Hugh possessed a mentality differing from that of the "French" rationalists such as Abelard. As we shall show later, Hugh's attitude does differ from Abelard's, but not because of some supposed nationalistic characteristics. It is a question of the environment of St. Victor.[1]

---

[1] "Hugues de Saint-Victor," Dictionnaire de théologie catholique, edd. A Vacant, E. Mangenot, and E. Amann. (3d. ed.; Paris 1926-1950), VII, i, 240-308: cf. esp. col. 242. This work cited hereafter as DTC followed by vol., pt., and cols. This article cited as Vernet, "Hugues de Saint-Victor."

[2] Baron, "Notes biographiques," p. 932.

[3] This is the opinion of R. Javelet, "Les origines de Hugues de Saint-Victor," RSR, XXXIV (1960), 74-83, esp. pp. 74 f. and 82 f.

In his study of Hugh's origins Croydon likewise attempts to correlate Hugh's origins with his later writings.[2] He argues that Hugh's mysticism is of a type associated with the Low Countries where mystical piety was contemplative not active, concerned with the soul more than with society after the manner of the Imitatio Christi. Secondly, Hugh's association with the thought represented by the School of Anselm of Laon and William of Champeaux is best explained if Hugh had come from the North of France, rather than Germany. With respect to Croydon's first correlation, Taylor has rightly sensed that Hugh's attitude is mystically oriented, but still intellectual. Furthermore it is contemplative yet very active and concerned with both the individual and society.[3] In short, Hugh's outlook does not fit the pattern Croydon suggests. As far as the second suggestion goes, the influences by Anselm and William are very apparent, but all of these can be accounted for by influences, particularly literary, which would not be determined by the absence of William from St. Victor when Hugh arrived, or the death of Anselm of Laon in 1117.[4]

---

[1] On the question of "deutscher Symbolismus" and Hugh's relationship to it, cf. infra, chap. I.

[2] "Notes on the Life," pp. 247 ff.

[3] Cf. Taylor, Origin, p. 9.

[4] On Hugh's relationship to the School of Anselm of Laon and William of Champeaux, cf. infra, pp. 27 ff.

Although the date of Hugh's birth is in doubt equally with his origin a few bits of information concerning his career have been pieced together. Our canon probably entered the Abbey of St. Victor between 1115 and 1118.[1] He began to teach and to write sometime between 1120 and 1125, probably nearer 1120.[2] With the assassination of Prior Thomas, who also served as the head of the Abbey school, Hugh succeeded to the direction of studies at St. Victor in 1133.[3] The claim that Hugh was also Prior of the house has been shown to be inadmissable.[4]

It is quite likely that High traveled some after his arrival at St. Victor. Vernet notes evidence that Hugh was present in 1139 for the nomination of a new abbot at Moringy.[5] His journeys may have been more extensive. A letter from Hugh to the canons of Lucca indicates that he spent some time with them.[6] The notice concerning Hugh's *De sacramentis christianae fidei* in the *Indiculum* states that part of *De sacramentis* was written at the Papal court at the bidding of Innocent II.[7] When combined these give credence to the idea of a journey to Rome by Hugh.[1]

---

[1] Taylor, *Origin*, p. 67. This dating is bound up with the Saxon origin theory and is somewhat arbitrary; cf. Baron, "Notes biographiques," p. 934.

[2] Cf. Damien van den Eynde, *Essai sur la succession et la date des écrits de Hugues de Saint-Victor* ("Spicilegium Pontificii Athenaei Antoniani," Vol. XIII; Rome, 1960), p. 207.

[3] Cf. Vernet, "Hughes de Saint-Victor," col. 242. Thomas was assassinated for his support of the Bishop of Paris in a dispute with the King, Louis VI. Cf. Bonnard, *Histoire*, pp. 33 ff.

[4] Cf. Croydon, "Notes on the Life," p. 249 f., citing new evidence to support Bonnard, *Histoire*, p. 89.

[5] Vernet, "Hugues de Saint-Victor," col. 243.

[6] Cf. Croydon, "Notes on the Life," pp. 250-52, with text, p. 251.

[7] Cf. de Ghellinck, "La table des matières de la première édition des oeuvres de Hugues de Saint-Victor," *RechSR*, I (1910), 270-89 and 385-96; cf. esp. pp. 282 and 396, concerning *Indiculum* IV, 1.

Hugh died, "gentle, pious, humble, and good," on February 11, 1141, in the infirmary of the Abbey.[2]

The foundation of the Abbey of St. Victor was the result of the decision of William of Champeaux to retire in 1108 with some of his students to an hermitage dedicated to St. Victor and located just outside the walls of the city of Paris.[3] There William and his confreres intended to take up a disciplined life of monastic regularity and to embrace the "apostolic life" of the new movement of Canons Regular.

This withdrawal has often been pictured as the result of the conflict between William of Champeaux and his brilliant, self-confident pupil, Peter Abelard.[4] Abelard, with his usual self-esteem, described the retirement of William as the retreat of a master bested in the classroom over the question of universals.[5] Seen in the context of the times, however, William's decision takes on a new aspect. It was not a retreat. It was the exchange of one ideal for another, and that not by necessity of the present moment. The decision of Master William, writes Dickinson, had been inspired by the sentiment--shared by many intellectuals of the age--that in the last resort scholastic employment was infinitely less satisfying than the cultivation of the soul through monastic discipline, and he evidently seriously considered the complete abandonment of his studies.[1]

---

[1] Croydon, "Notes on the Life," p. 252.

[2] Cf. the letter of Osbert, MPL 175:cxliii.

[3] Cf. Bonnard, Histoire, pp. 5 f.

[4] Cf., e.g., Frederick Copleston, A History of Philosophy, Vol. II, Mediaeval Philosophy: Augustine to Scotus (Westminster, Md., 1950), p. 148. Cited hereafter as Copleston, History.

[5] Cf. Bonnard, Histoire, p. 5. Copleston, History, II, 136-55, treats the development of the problem of universals.

William's exile was short lived. In a letter commending the Parisian master's decision to "put aside ecclesiastical advancement and to prefer 'the lowest place in the house of your God to living in the tents of the unrighteous' (Ps. lxxxii. 11)" Hildebert of Lavardin continued by admonishing William that, praiseworthy as taking the habit might be, he must not forsake teaching:

> A man does not do all the good of which he is capable so long as he refuses to be useful to others. . . . Render therefore your whole self to the Lord God seeing you have vowed your whole self to Him, . . . It is the same with learning; when one shows it to others it bears increase: but, . . . unless it is shown to the world, it escapes from him. Take good care therefore not to deprive your brethren of the founts of living water, but as Solomon says, "pour out the springs and spread their waters abroad" (Prov. v. 15).[2]

William responded to this friendly admonition by resuming his teaching office.[3] As a result, the fundamental orientation of the new community of Canons Regular of St. Victor was firmly established. From thenceforth the community would be motivated by a "new and complex idea of a religious life where knowledge would not be excluded."[4] It was to the guiding spirit of William of Champeaux that the Abbey of St. Victor owed this structuring of its corporate personality. Hugh of St. Victor embraced the ideal established by William and gave it vital and vigorous expression in his life and in his writings.

---

[1] J. C. Dickinson, The Origins of the Austin Canons and Their Introduction into England (London, 1950), p. 190. Cited hereafter as Dickinson, Austin Canons.

[2] MPL 171:141-143. Trans. via Dickinson, Austin Canons., p. 190.

[3] Cf. Bonnard, Histoire, p. 10. William established a course of studies embracing the liberal arts, philosophy, and theology. Apparently he taught rhetoric.

[4] J. Chatillon, "De Guillaume de Champeaux à Thomas Gallus: Chronique d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale de l'école de Saint-Victor," RMAL, VIII (1952), 139-62. Cf. esp. p. 146. Cited hereafter as Chatillon, "Chronique."

It was this breadth of comprehension and singleness of ideal which made St. Victor an outstanding factor in the Parisian scene. Within the walls of the cloister an attitude was cultivated which remained open to the currents of intellectual life stirring in the Parisian schools while maintaining a steadfast fidelity to the ancient tradition of monastic spirituality. Chatillon has characterized it as an atmosphere notable above all for a profound love of Scripture and tradition, joined with an extraordinary intellectual curiosity and equally ardent desire to place the many facets of human knowledge at the service of the Christian faith and the knowledge of God.[1] To this perceptive judgment must be added the element of liturgical regularity and homiletic practice which shaped the life of St. Victor with an equal force.

> The regulation of the daily life applies [the great principles of common life, charity, and equality]. The canonical hours and the celebration of the eucharist mark the rhythm of each day. The religious feasts and anniversaries so cherished by the Victorines mark out the course of the year: such as those of Sts. Augustine and Gregory. Men preached during these liturgical solemnities. They preached frequently at St. Victor, and we have numerous manuscripts to show it.[2]

If Hugh of St. Victor built upon the foundations laid by William of Champeaux in giving to the school of St. Victor its definitive intellectual and spiritual frame, the credit for the solidification of the Abbey as an institution must go to the first Abbot, the judicious diplomat and administrator Guilduin. Guilduin was evidently among those who first withdrew to St. Victor with William,[1] and he was made Abbot shortly after William left St. Victor to become Bishop of Chalons in 1113.[2]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Dumeige, Richard de Saint-Victor, p. 19.

Guilduin, too, built upon the foundations laid by William of Champeaux for William had been on good terms with the Bishop of Paris and the King, Louis VI.[3] When William left St. Victor, the King granted the community a charter as a royal abbey, handsomely endowed it, and gave it the right to maintain a school.[4] Royal largesse continued to enrich the Abbey as it built up a significant library and an imposing structure.[5] Victorine tradition, recorded in the Abbey Necrology, credits then one Reinhold, uncle of Hugh of St. Victor, with the provision of funds to erect the Abbey Church and to provide magnificent furnishings.[6]

---

[1] Cf. Bonnard, Histoire, p. 7.

[2] Ibid., pp. 19 ff.

[3] Ibid., pp. 5 ff. and p. 28.

[4] Ibid., pp. 13 f. for a trans. of text of charter.

[5] Ibid., pp. 20-28 and 191 ff. for continued donations. The library of St. Victor remained open for students and others. From an early date the canons showed their concern for books by inscribing in the Abbey Necrology the names of donors to the library. Cf. Dumeige, Richard de Saint-Victor, p. 19. Rabelais satirized the Victorine library in his Pantagruel, but his list of "books" is of little help in reconstituting the library. On the library, cf. A. Franklin, L'histoire de la bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor à Paris (Paris, 1865), and the remarks of Dumeige, p. 19, n. 2.

[6] The Necrology is found in MSS Paris, BN lat. 14673 and 14674, one of the fourteenth century but a copy of an older MS, the other of the fifteenth century. Cf. Bonnard, Histoire, p. xxix. The relevant text of the Necrology is for May 5, and is found reproduced in Taylor, Origin, p. 60.

By astute administration Guilduin continued to maintain good relations with both Bishop and King, even in the aftermath of a dispute between the two which led to the assassination of the Prior Thomas.[1] Under Guilduin's administration the Abbey flourished and enjoyed perhaps her finest hours. Later in the century a period of poor leadership seriously depleted the resources of the Abbey and probably contributed to the decline of Victorine vitality and influence.[2]

Under the abbacy of Guilduin the internal life of the Abbey took definitive shape. The very influential custumal of St. Victor, the Liber ordinis, appears to have been compiled during his time.[3] Also during Guilduin's time the Abbey associated itself with the Rule of St. Augustine, the rule which became normative for houses of Regular Canons. The late date at which this Rule was formally adopted by the Victorines supports the thesis of Dickinson that the movement of Canons Regular did not associate itself with the Rule of St. Augustine from the first, but only gradually took St. Augustine as its patron.[4]

---

[1] Cf. Bonnard, Histoire, pp. 33 ff.

[2] Ibid., pp. 231-35 on the Abbot Ervisius. The latter half of the century saw a decline in the intellectual life of the Abbey, also. Ibid., p. 277. Cf. Dickinson, Austin Canons, p. 89, who suggests that administrative failure and lack of local resources were major factors in the decline of the houses of Canons Regular.

[3] Bonnard, Histoire, p. 48.

[4] Cf. Austin Canons, pp. 60 ff. On the complex history of the development of the regular canonical movement and the place of the Rule of St. Augustine in that development, cf. in addition to Dickinson the work of Ch. Derine, Les Chanoines réguliers au diocèse de Liège avant Saint Norbert (Bruxelles, 1952), esp. pp. 9-32, and "Chanoines," DHGE, XII, 353-405.

The Augustinian Rule was an ideal vehicle for the Victorine ideal, for it provided a flexible basis for organizing the common life of the community around the two foci of liturgical regularity and intellectual endeavor. The *Liber ordinis* demonstrates the seriousness with which the Victorines embraced the common life, for, as Bonnard has shown, it was heavily indebted to Cistercian usages.[1] Sometime before 1139 St. Victor became the head of an independent congregation of houses of Canons Regular and the *Liber ordinis* exerted an even greater influence upon the development of houses of Regular Canons.[2] Dickinson has summarized the position of St. Victor's by saying that:

> Favoured by the highest officials of Church and State, esteemed all over the Western world, the haven of scholars and nursery of bishops, St. Victor's displayed perhaps more than any other house the potential of the regular canonical life.[3]

The Victorine community drew its members from various countries thus reflecting the increased mobility of the times as well as the attractiveness of the Abbey as a center of learning and spirituality. Hugh, as we have seen, came from either the Low Countries or from Saxony. Richard of St. Victor, who followed Hugh in developing the distinctive style of Victorine mysticism, was probably of Scottish origin.[4]

---

[1] *Histoire*, pp. 142, 148-49. [2] Dickinson, *Austin Canons*, pp. 85 f.

[3] *Ibid*., p. 86.

[4] Dumeige, *Richard De Saint-Victor*, p. 166. Cf. the annotated bibliography of Riccardian studies in *ibid*., pp. 171 ff. For an excellent introduction and English trans. of extracts from the *Benjamin Minor* and *Benjamin Major*, several shorter extracts, and also *Of the Four Degrees of Passionate Charity*, cf. *Richard of Saint-Victor: Selected Writings on Contemplation*, trans. with introd. and notes by C. Kirchberger. Cited hereafter as Kirchberger, *Richard of Saint-Victor*.

Adam of St. Victor, whose magnificent liturgical poetry immeasurably enhanced the liturgy of St. Victor and of the Church at large, was a Breton.[1] There were others from England, Norway, Rome, and elsewhere.[2]

Teaching at St. Victor was carried out during the regular round of daily canonical duties. According to Bonnard there was no specific time set aside for formal instruction after the manner of the schools.[3] There were, however, several occasions during the day which offered ample opportunity for Hugh to present his ideas to the canons and for discussion to take place. From Noon until Vespers the canons gathered in the cloister for the _hora locutionis_ at which time they were allowed to talk. Bonnard suggests that during this time the Victorine masters might gather their pupils about them for a period of formal instruction and the raising of questions.[4] Very likely the treatise _De arca Noe morali_ had its origin during one of these afternoon collations.[5] After Vespers time was devoted to various kinds of individual study, but no conversation was permitted. Later, the canons gathered in the refectory for a modest evening meal and a more formal lecture or collation.[1] Finally, mention must be made of the daily chapter. Visitors were admitted to the meeting along with the canons, the outsiders being dismissed immediately after the lecture or sermon. As Bonnard suggests this would offer an opportunity for Hugh or Richard to address not only the canons but persons external to the community as well.[2]

---

[1] Cf. Bonnard, _Histoire_, p. 55. For Adam's works, cf. _The Liturgical Poetry of Adam of St. Victor. From the Text of Gautier_, trans. Digby S. Wrangham (3 vols.; London, 1881). Cited hereafter as Wrangham, _Liturgical Poetry_. A German trans. of sel. sequences with an introduction by Hans Rosenberg will be found in Paul Wolff, ed., _Die Viktoriner: Mystische Schriften_, pp. 305 ff. For a summary of the critical study of Adam's poetry, cf. Chatillon, "Chronique," pp. 247-49.

[2] Bonnard, _Histoire_, pp. 55 f. [3] _Histoire_, p. 115.

[4] _Ibid._, pp. 78-80.

[5] Cf. _infra_, ch. IV.

It is quite clear that during Hugh's lifetome external students were able to attend lectures at St. Victor. We possess a letter written by one Laurentius, who was a secular, which demonstrates this.[3] Laurentius went to Paris and sought out Hugh of St. Victor on the advice of a friend of his who was a monk. In a letter to his friend Maurice, Laurentius related that, having been encouraged by his friends, he had taken notes during Hugh's lectures and had submitted them to the master weekly for correction. Hugh received the idea gladly. He revised the notes and approved them. Laurentius, in turn, sent a copy of these notes to his friend, and apparently they were copied by others. Two things are significant in this correspondence. First, there is the clear fact that the Abbey maintained an open school, at least while Hugh taught. Second, the notes to which Laurentius prefaced his letter form the first detailed evidence of a reportatio. The practice of taking down a master's lectures, having them corrected by the master, and then publishing them for the use of other students later became an established university practice.[1] Laurentius and his friends at St. Victor give the impression that they thought they were inventing "a new and time-saving device."[2] The course of lectures which Laurentius so eagerly attended was an early form of the material later given definitive shape in *De sacramentis christianae fidei*.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Bonnard, Histoire, pp. 80 f. [2] Ibid., p. 74.

[3] Cf. the text as published by B. Bischoff, "Aus der Schule Hugos von St. Viktor," Aus der Geisteswelt des Mittelalters ("BGPTMA," Suppl. III, 1; Münster, 1935). pp. 246-50.

Although the Abbey school was later closed to students the library remained open for their use and the Abbey continued to maintain relationships with the students in Paris. Throughout the century the canons provided a confessional for the students, a practice introduced by Guilduin.[4] Also, hospitality might be offered to some. St. Bernard commended Peter the Lombard to the care of the brothers of St. Victor during a short visit to Paris by the future author of the *Sentences*.[5]

---

[1] Cf. Rashdall, *Universities of Europe*, I, 490.

[2] Smalley, *SBMA*, p. 202.

[3] Cf. H. Weisweiller, "Die Arbeitsmethode Hugos von St. Viktor. Ein Beitrag zum Entstehen seines Hauptwerkes De sacramentis," *Scholastik*, XX-XXIV (1949), 256-66. Weisweiller has also analyzed the influence of the *Reportatio* of Laurentius on other twelfth-century works in "Zur Einflussphäre der *Vorlesungen* Hugos von St. Viktor," *Melanges Joseph de Ghellinck, S. J.* (2 vols.; "Museum Lessianum," Sect. historique, No. 13 and 14; Gembloux, 1951), pp. 526-81.

[4] Cf. Bonnard, *Histoire*, p. 151.

[5] *Ibid*., p. 56 and n. 1.

In all aspects of his activity Hugh of St. Victor reflected a point of view which was at the same time traditionalist and progressive. In this, his spirit was at one with that of the regular canonical movement. While predicating the reason for their existence in a return to the "apostolic life" of the primitive church these men nevertheless were conscious of being and were accused of being something new in the structure of Christendom.[1] The Augustinian Rule offered a unique vehicle for attempting to meet the crisis of the bifurcation of the mind and body of the Church in the division between the cloister and the urban schools.

Following generations could not praise Hugh enough. For Jacques de Vitry Hugh was the "harp of God, the organ of the Holy Spirit," a man who "encouraged many to honorable lives by the example of his saintly manner of life and instructed many in knowledge by [his] sweet doctrine."[2] Hugh's writings continue the effect of his life: "He dug wells of living waters in his books, which discuss faith and morals both subtly and smoothly."[3] How clearly the Dominican preacher caught the Victorine spirit of knowledge and love which work together. Others hailed Hugh as the "second Augustine."[1] Thomas Aquinas would note Hugh's opinion as magisterial and having the "strength of authority" (robor auctoritatis).[2]

---

[1] "The Augustinians represented an order of things which, even on their own showing, was largely novel, at least to contemporaries." Dickinson, *Austin Canons*, p. 197.

[2] *Historia occidentalis*, II, 24. Cited by Martin Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der Scholastischen Methode* (2 vols.; Freiberg im Breisgau, 1911), p. 230 and n. 2. Cited hereafter as Grabmann, *GSM*.

[3] *Ibid*. The *sua viter* of Grabmann's text corrected to *suaviter* following the text printed in MPL 175:clxv.

It remained for Bonaventure to render full appreciation of the breadth of Hugh's contribution to the life of his age and to signal his universal accomplishments. In De reductione artium ad theologiam Bonaventure distinguished three parts of "theology."[3] They were ratiocinatio, praedicatio, and contemplatio. Of the Fathers of the Church, Augustine excelled in the first area, while Gregory the Great was outstanding in preaching, and Dionysius the pseudo-Areopagite was the guide for the spiritual life. Of the modern masters Bonaventure noted three, each of whom had excelled in one of these areas. Anselm of Canterbury had followed in the footsteps of Augustine. St. Bernard had taken up the mantle of Gregory the Great. Richard of St. Victor was found to be the follower of the Areopagite in the contemplative life. But there was one man who had excelled not in one but in all three of the parts of "theology." That man was Hugh of St. Victor.

---

[1] Cf., e.g., Anonymus Carthusiensis, De Religionum origine. Martene, Ampliss. Collect., IV, 55, as cited by B. Hauréau, Les oeuvres de Hugues de Saint-Victor: essai critique (Nouv. ed.; Paris, 1886). This last cited hereafter as Hauréau, Les oeuvres.

[2] Cf. Summa theologiae, II, II, q. 5, a. 1, ad. 1.

[3] Cited in Grabmann, GSM, II, 231. Cf. Bonaventure, Opera Omnia (Quracchi, 1891), V, 321. Bonaventure uses the phrase tota sacra Scriptura which Grabmann interprets "Theologie."

Hugh probably would have objected to the easy manner in which the Franciscan master parcelled out the divisions of sacred studies. In this matter of division Bonaventure reflected the specialization of a later age. But he also accurately sensed the unity which pervaded the work and thought of Hugh of St. Victor. Hugh sought to weld into a unity reasoning, preaching, and contemplation. More than that, he sought to mold all of human learning, secular and sacred, into an ordered, harmonious whole, ultimately at the service of Biblical *lectio* and the contemplative life.

Hugh was endowed with a singlemindedness of purpose and a breadth of comprehension rare enough in any age. He brought the whole range of human activity within the compass of the *Didascalicon*. In that work he sought to order all knowledge toward the one goal of the quest for that "Wisdom in which the Form of the Perfect Good stands fixed."[1] Hugh steadfastly refused to choose between the arts and theology, or between biblical *lectio* and doctrinal *quaestio*. Each had its place within the ordered discipline of the Victorine synthesis. "The lower knowledge rightly ordered leads to the higher."[1] Philosophy, which is the "love of that Wisdom which, wanting in nothing, is a living Mind and the sole primordial Idea or Pattern of things,"[2] was divided into the theoretical, practical, mechanical, and logical branches. Hugh continued by further subdividing this pattern of the parts of philosophy until twenty-eight units were distinguished.[3] Theoretical sciences, having to do most especially with knowledge strictly understood, included theology, mathematics, and physics. Mathematics in turn was divided into arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy, the traditional quadrivium of medieval education. Practical knowledge, which considered the discipline of morals, had three parts: Individual, household, and civil ethics. The mechanical sciences were seven in number and dealt not with the restoration of man's lost integrity like the theoretical and practical sciences, but rather with the alleviation of his bodily needs. They were: Fabric making, armament, commerce, agriculture, hunting, medicine, theatrics. The fourth part of philosophy, logic, had two divisions, grammar and the theory of argument. The latter had demonstration, probable argument, and sophistic as its parts. Probable argument was composed of dialectic and rhetoric. Here we find the *trivium*, tucked away in the fourth division of philosophy.

---

[1] *Didascalicon*, I, 1. Cf. Charles Henry Buttimer, *Hugonis de Sancto Victore Didascalicon De Studio Legendi: A Critical Text* ("The Catholic University of America. Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin," Vol. X; Washington, D. C., 1939), p. 4. Cf. the English translation by Jerome Taylor, *The "Didascalicon" of Hugh of St. Victor* ("Columbia University. Records of Civilization Sources and Studies," No. LXIV; New York, 1961), p. 45. Hereafter cited as *Did.*, followed by book and chapter and the pages of the critical text and the translation indicated by Butt. and Tay. respectively. Hugh's definition here adapted from Boethius, *De consolatione philosophiae* iii, pr. x. The commentary tradition on *De consolatione* identified the "Form of the Good" with the Second Person of the Trinity. All truth thus has ultimate religious value in relating man to God through Christ. Cf. J. Pedersen, "Recherche de la sagesse d'apres Hugues de Saint-Victor," *Classica et mediaevalia*, XVI (1955), 91-133, and Taylor, *Did.*, P. 175, n. 1, and p. 181, n. 19.

---

[1] De sacramentis christianae fidei, I, prol., vi, MPL 176:1850. Cf. Roy J. Deferrari, trans., Hugh of Saint Victor on the Sacraments of the Christian Faith (De sacramentis) ("The Mediaeval Academy of America, Publications," No. LVIII; Cambridge, Mass., 1951), p. 5. Cited hereafter as DS followed by Book, Part, and Chapter (I, vi, 5), and page of translation cited as Def.

[2] Did., II, i, Butt., p. 23, Tay., p. 61.

[3] Cf. Did., I-III, Butt., pp. 4-69, Tay., pp. 46-101 and esp. the summary of the scheme at III, 1, Butt., p. 48, Tay., p. 83. For Hugh's attitude toward philosophy and its place cf. Taylor, Did., introd., and Baron, Sci. et Sg., pp. 35-96. The four-fold scheme was ultimately derived from Aristotle's distinction of theory and practice, to which Hugh has added the mechanical and logical sciences. Cf. B. Geyer, Die Patristische und Scholastische Philosophie, Vol. II of Friedrich Üeberwegs Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie (11th ed. rev.; Berlin, 1928), p. 263. Hereafter cited as Üeberweg-Geyer, Grundriss, II. This scheme breaks with the general Platonic scheme of physics, ethics, and logic which dominated the West under Augustine's authority. Hugh was motivated in his new scheme by ultimate loyalty to Augustine; he integrated a current Aristotelian division into a system of thought radically Augustinian. Cf. Taylor, Did., p. 8.

Of the twenty-eight divisions of philosophy Hugh singled out the seven liberal arts, contained in the *trivium* and *quadrivium*, as the basis for all learning:

> It is in the seven liberal arts, however, that the foundation of all learning is to be found. Before all others these ought to be had at hand, because without them the philosophical disciple does not and cannot explain and define anything.[1]

For the benefit of the student of the arts Hugh wrote several treatises. We possess copies of a *De grammatica* and a *Practica geometriae*, as well as a short work entitled *De ponderibus et mensuris*, texts of which have recently been published by Baron.[2]

---

[1] *Did.*, III, 4, Butt., p. 55, Tay., p. 89. Cf. *ibid.*, 3, Butt., pp. 52 ff., Tay., pp. 86 ff.

[2] *De grammatica* and *Practica geometriae* are found edited with *Epitome Dindimi in philosophiam* in R. Baron, ed., *Hugonis de Sancto Victore Opera Propaedeutica* ("University of Notre Dame Publications in Mediaeval Studies," Vol. XX; Notre Dame, 1966). *De ponderibus et mensuris* is in R. Baron, "Hugues de Saint-Victor lexicographe," *Cultura néolatina*, XVI (1956), 132-37.

In the discipline of studies at St. Victor the liberal arts course was the preparation for the study of Scripture.[1] Within the context of the Biblical lectio Hugh sought, in turn, to integrate both doctrinal study and the meditative reading of Scripture which was characteristic of the Western monastic tradition and was a practice oriented toward the nuturing of the contemplative life. The way in which this was effected will be considered in Chapter I.

Hugh was able, for his part, to hold this vast synthesis of all learning in one coherent whole. Succeeding generations failed to do so. Hugh found many successors in various disciplines. Andrew followed his insistence on the need for literal exegesis in Biblical studies,[2] Peter Comestor's Historia scholastica transferred to the schools the fundamental Victorine concern for the historical narrative of Scripture.[3] Richard developed Hugh's mystical teachings.[4] Peter the Lombard and numerous others made use of Hugh's penetrating summaries of doctrine in De sacramentis.[5] Yet no one really maintained the Hugonian synthesis. It demanded too much. Miss Smalley has accurately sensed the situation in writing:

---

[1] The liberal arts and philosophy are considered at length by R. Baron, Science et Sagesse chez Hugues de Saint-Victor (Paris, 1957), pp. 35-96. Cited hereafter as Baron, Sci. et Sg.

[2] Cf. Smalley SBMA, chap. IV.

[3] Ibid., pp. 196 ff. Smalley calls the success of the Historia "the greatest triumph for the Victorine tradition." Cf. p. 214. The Comestor's work was placed on a par with that of Peter the Lombard.

[4] Cf. Kirchberger, Richard of Saint-Victor, p. 48. Richard hailed Hugh as "one of the greatest theologians of our time."

[5] Cf. de Ghellinck, MT, pp. 195 f.

> The programme was both too conservative and too modern. It would have made any kind of academic specialization quite impossible and yet specialization was just what it demanded. Moreover it implied too high a tension between the academic and the religious life. Hugh's ideal exegete was a combination of Paris master and contemplative religious which only exceptional circumstances could produce.[1]

Hugh of St. Victor's "brief summa . . . of all doctrine," De sacramentis christianae fidei, was one of the most creative theological works of the twelfth century.[2] Rather than presenting a collection of citations from Patristic sources arranged in a more or less systematic form, after the manner of contemporary collections of sententiae, Hugh sought to construct a systematic presentation of ideas of the Fathers.[3]

Two recent studies of the sources used by Hugh in compiling De sacramentis have further clarified his relationship to Patristic thought and to the theological currents of his own day.[4] Both studies conclude

---

1. SBMA, p. 105.

2. Text in MPL 176:173-618. Cf. Roy J. Deferrari, trans. Hugh of Saint Victor On the Sacraments of the Christian Faith (De sacramentis) ("Publications of the Mediaeval Society of America," No. 58; Cambridge, Mass., 1951).

3. This contrast stressed by Grabmann, GSM, II, 253 f. Cf. J. de Ghellinck, "Eucharistie," DTC, V, 1258, who notes Hugh's difference from the methods of his contemporaries. Hugh does not cite a single patristic text in the section on the Eucharist, but rather offers an exposition of doctrine, well reasoned and thought out and strongly inspired by the tradition. Hugh has so penetrated the essence of patristic doctrine that he feels no need to add citations.

4. Cf. L. Ott, "Hugo von St. Viktor und die Kirchenväter," Divus Thomas (Fribourg), XXVII (1949), 180-200 and 293-332; and H. Weisweiller, "Die Arbeitsmethode," pp. 159-87 and 232-67. Weisweiller has also analyzed the use which Hugh made of his own earlier writings, often after several redactions, in compiling De sacramentis. Cf. "Zur Einflussphäre der Vorlesungen Huges von St. Viktor," Mélanges J. de Ghellinck (Gembloux, 1951), II, 527-82.

that Hugh's thought was rooted in the theology of the Fathers.[1] He was particularly indebted to Augustine, hence the title "the second Augustine." The influence of Ambrose, Jerome, and Gregory the Great, along with other authors, is equally clear. Although Hugh like other men of his time was indebted to *florilegia* and other collections of extracts from the Fathers, his works show the unmistakable stamp of "an immediate, personal study of at least the most important writings of the Fathers."[2]

Hugh also made use of his contemporaries and near-contemporaries in writing *De sacramentis*. In the sections of the work dealing with the liturgy and the sacraments he depended very heavily upon the sermons and the *Panormia* of Ivo of Chartres.[3] Likewise, at one point Hugh incorporated the text of a letter which he had received from St. Bernard.[4]

One of the most striking and important elements of *De sacramentis* lies in the structural principle which Hugh adopted. The work was arranged according to the historical sequence of the temporal unfolding of the work of creation and the work of restoration. Thus Hugh made the unfolding of sacred history the ordering principle of his major theological work. Clearly subordinate, but still operative, was the principle of the logical correlation of doctrinal topics.[5] In so proceeding, Hugh retained

---

1. Cf. Weisweiller, "Die Arbeitsmethode," pp. 87 and 266 f. Ott, "Hugo von St. Viktor," pp. 331 f.

2. *Ibid*., p. 331. 3. Cf. Weisweiller, "Die Arbeitsmethode," pp. 75 ff.

4. *Ibid*., pp. 63 f.

5. Cf., e.g., *DS*, I, ix, 1, MPL 176:317B, Def., p. 154: "To those who wish to treat of the sacraments, four primary considerations present themselves: first, what is a sacrament; second, why were sacraments instituted; third, what is the matter of each sacrament in which it is made and sanctified; fourth, how many kinds of sacraments are there--that is definition, cause, matter, division?"

a sure contact with the historical matrix within which the Christian religion had been articulated. As Chenu has commented, "Hugh's work is 'built up' and carried through within 'sacred history.'"[1]

Hugh described the structure of De sacramentis christianae fidei in the following manner, laying emphasis upon the necessary historical perspective:

> Since the works of foundation were first in time, we have begun our discussion with these, that thence we may make our way to the other works which follow in their order. For we call the works of foundation the creation of all things, . . .
>
> Therefore, in the works of restoration the mystery of the redemption must be investigated from the beginning. And if we inquire into this carefully in all these works according to the sequence of time and the succession of generations and the dispensations of precepts, we declare with confidence that we shall have touched upon the whole sum of Divine Scriptures. But we must begin with the foundation of our first parents, and we must develop the story gradually as we proceed always to those works which follow in order.[2]

In the twelfth-century another method of proceeding in doctrinal discussion emerged in the work of Abelard.[3] This new method completely abandoned any reference to the historical structure of the Christian religion. All the elements and events constituting the economy of salvation were reduced to logical categories. Thus it was possible to order the essentials of the faith in light of general notions and principles. Such a procedure was clearly reflected in the structure of Abelard's theological works. Therein *fides*, *caritas*, *sacramentum* are the three elements which sum up the totality of Biblical revelation.[1] The first comprises the "mysteries" (the Trinity, Incarnation, creation, and original sin); the second, ethics (charity, the virtues, the commandments); and the third, the ecclesiastical sacraments. Present-day equivalents would be dogmatic, moral, and sacramental theology.

---

[1] Cf. Toward Understanding Saint Thomas, trans. with authorized corrections and bibliographical additions by A.-M. Landry and D. Hughes (Chicago, 1964), p. 302. Cited hereafter as Chenu, Saint Thomas. Cf. also, idem, TDS, pp. 68 f.

[2] Bk. I, pt., i, chaps. 28-29, MPL 176:204, Def., pp. 26 f.

[3] For the following, cf. the judicious remarks of Chenu, Saint Thomas, pp. 302-04. Cf., also, Baron, Sci. et Sg., pp. 235, and de Ghellinck, MT, pp. 161 ff.

Through the influence of William of Champeaux at St. Victor Hugh came in contact with the methods and doctrines of Anselm of Laon.[2] William had been a student, first of Manegold of Lautenbach and later had studied under Anselm at the cathedral school in Laon.[3] Only recently has the literary evidence of the doctrinal teaching of Anselm and his students been identified. We now possess a large number of collections of *sententiae* grouped together under the rubric "The School of Anselm of Laon and William of Champeaux."[4] Most of the collections stem not from the direct authorship of William and Anselm but rather from their pupils. Dom Lottin has now suggested all of the teaching at Laon was given in the form of Biblical commentary and that the collections of sentences which consist only of doctrinal questions represent the work of students in excerpting such questions from the lectures and bringing them together in independent collections.[1] If this is true, in the School of Anselm of Laon and William of Champeaux we confront the rise of the transition from divinitas, or theology, contained within the Biblical commentary, to the separation of theology from exegesis.

---

[1] Cf. *Introductio ad theologiam*, I, i, 2, MPL 178:981-986, and the structure of *Sic et non*. de Ghellinck, *MT*, p. 161, points out that Abelard "obviously borrowed" his scheme from Augustine's *Enchiridion de fide*, *spe et charitate*, replacing the section on hope with one on the sacraments.

[2] Cf. H. Weisweiller, *Das Schrifttum der Schule Anselms von Laon und Wilhelms von Champeaux in deutschen Bibliotheken* ("BGPTMA," Vol. XXXIII, 1-2; München, 1936), pp. 3 f. Weisweiller holds that through the influence of William the "Parisian school of [St. Victor] would become a new, further developed locale for the manner of thought of Laon."

[3] Cf. Chatillon, "Chronique," p. 142.

[4] The grouping was proposed chiefly by Weisweiller, cf. "L'Ecole d' Anselme de Laon et de Guillaume de Champeaux; Noveaux Documents," *RTAM*, IV (1932), 237-69 and 371-92.

Hugh opposed this separation of theology and exegesis, but he was open to the new developments in theological method. In his De sacramentis christianae fidei, molded by his orientation toward history and inserted in the sequence of courses at St. Victor so that it was part of the preparation for allegorical exegesis, Hugh shows an attitude very much attune to the contemporary interest in raising and solving of dogmatic questions. "Theses, demonstrations, difficulties and responses follow one another . . . sometimes with a certain vivacity or with a lively and animated allure, worthy of a dialogue, . . ."[2] H. Weisweiller, whose studies have revealed the extent of the influence of the School of Anselm of Laon and William of Champeaux, has pointed out the doctrinal influences of that School upon the work of Hugh of St. Victor, both in the context of his sacramental theology and his theology in general.[3] In this again we see the openness shown by

---

[1] Cf. "Nouveaux fragments théologiques de l'école d'Anselme de Laon: Conclusions et tables," RTAM, XIV (1947), 159-65. Lottin has proposed that the Miscellanea of Hugh of St. Victor may also be the result of excerpts collected from Hugh's Biblical commentaries, now lost, by students. Cf. "Quelques reçueils d'écrits attribues à Hugues de Saint-Victor," RTAM, XXV (1958) 248-84, esp. p. 280.

[2] Cf. de Ghellinck, MT, p. 194.

[3] Cf. Die Wirksamkeit der Sakramente nach Hugo von St. Viktor (Freiburg, 1932) where numerous parallels are cited. Also cf. the article cited above, p. 27, n. 4.

Hugh toward that which he found acceptable in the emerging scholastic movement in the twelfth century.

An approach to the study of Victorine mysticism is beset with the problem of classifying the Victorines. One must be cautious. P. Pourrat has characterized the mysticism of Hugh and Richard as "speculative" in contrast to the more "affective" type of mystical devotion shown by St. Bernard.[1] The problem with such categorization is shown by Gilson's presentation of Bernard and the Victorines as the two foci for the development of speculative mysticism in the twelfth century.[2] Bernard and Hugh, each in his own way, were both interested in speculating on the "causes and conditions which make [the mystic experience] possible."[3]

Hugh and Richard moved the Western contemplative tradition in a new direction. In their writings the contemplative life was subjected to a rigorous analysis and was, in many respects, systematized.[4] Both men were keenly interested in pyschology and their mystical treatises, especially those of Richard, present "a systematic account of the processes of knowledge up to the moment of ecstasy: . . ."[1]

---

[1] Cf. La spiritualité chrétienne (4 vols.; Paris, 1926), II, 148-192.

[2] Cf. History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages (New York, 1954), pp. 164-71. Cited hereafter as Gilson, History. Cf. also the same author's The Mystical Theology of Saint Bernard, trans. A. H. C. Downes (London, 1940).

[3] Gilson, History, p. 166.

[4] Patrick J. Healy, "The Mysticism of the School of Saint Victor," Church History, I (1932), 211-21, considers the systematizing of mystical experience the chief contribution of the Victorines. Prior to the Victorines the subject of mysticism was treated in the context of individual experience. With them it became an object of analysis.

One of the most profound effects of the Victorine school was the revival of interest in the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius. This was a critical moment in the history of Western mysticism, for through the Victorines the influence of Dionysius was responsible for the *via negativa* recognizable in German, Flemish, French, and Spanish mystics.[2]

Hugh's positive relationship to the Dionysian writings has not always been appreciated. Vernet judged Hugh to be simply a "pale disciple of pseudo-Denys and John Scotus Erigenia."[3] In the work of H. Weisweiller and R. Roques the degree to which Vernet misjudged Hugh's relationship to Denys has become apparent.[4] In his *Commentaria in Hierarchiam coelestem S. Dionysii*

---

[1] Cf. Kirchberger, *Richard of Saint Victor*, p. 58. For valuable studies of Victorine epistemology and psychology, cf. H. Ostler, *Die Psychologie Hugos von St. Viktor* ("BGPTMA," Vol. VI, 1; Münster, 1906), J. Kleinz, *The Theory of Knowledge of Hugh of Saint-Victor* ("The Catholic University of America Philosophical Studies," Vol. LXXXVII; Washington, D.C., 1944), and J. Ebner, *Die Erkenntnislehre Richards von St. Victor* ("BGPTMA," Vol. XIX, 4; Münster, 1907).

[2] Cf. Kirchberger, *Richard of Saint-Victor*, p. 48. Cf. C. Butler, *Western Mysticism* (2d ed.; New York, 1966), for a critical analysis of the impact of Dionysian thought upon the tradition of Western spirituality represented by Augustine, Gregory, and Bernard. Butler characterizes the mystical thought of all three men as pre-Dionysian.

[3] "Hugues de Saint-Victor," col. 287.

[4] Cf. Weisweiller, "Die Ps.-Dionysiuskommentare 'In coelestem Hierarchiam' des Skotus Eriugena und Hugos von St. Viktor," *RTAM*, XIX (1952), 26-47; "Sakrament als Symbol und Teilhabe. Der Einfluss des Ps.-Dionysius auf die allgemeine Sakramentenlehre Hugos von St-Viktor," *Scholastik*, XXVII (1952), 321-43; "Sacramentum fidei: Augustinische und ps.-dionysische Gedanken in der Glaubensauffassung Hugos von St. Viktor," *Theologie in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. J. Auer and H. Volk (München, 1957), pp. 433-56. R. Roques, "Connaissance de Dieu et théologie symbolique d'apres l''In Hierarchiam coelestem sancti Dionysii' de Hugues de Saint-Victor," in *Structures Théologiques*

Areopagitae,[1] Hugh was both a faithful expositor and a subtle reinerpreter of Dionysian themes. By careful exegesis Hugh laid bare the fundamental notions of Dionysius' thought for successive generations of readers.[2] At the same time, however, Hugh also offered an interpretation which moved more in the direction of his Augustinian heritage.[3] In appraising Hugh's work as an expositor of pseudo-Dionysius, Roques summarizes by saying:

---

de la Gnose a Richard de Saint-Victor: *Essais et analyses critiques* (Paris, 1962), pp. 294-364. Cited hereafter as Roques, "Connaissance de Dieu." Cf. Baron, *Etudes sur Hugues de Saint-Victor* (Bruges, 1963), pp. 133-213. For Dionysian thought in itself, cf. *idem*, *L'univers dionysien* ("Theologie," Vol. XXIX; Paris, 1954). Cf. the introduction in M. de Gandillac, trans., *Oeuvres completes du Pseudo-Denys l'Areopagite*. The article "Denys l'Areopagie (Le pseudo-)," in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualite*, III, 245-429, is indispensible. This dictionary cited hereafter as *DdS*. Cf. the portion of the article "Contemplation," concerned with Dionysius in *DdS*, II, ii, 1885 ff.

[1] Text found in MPL 175:923-1154. Cited hereafter as *In hierarchiam* or as *IHC*. Baron has noted the need for a critical text and has indicated he may undertake such, cf. *Etudes*, p. 135.

[2] Weisweiller, "Die Ps.-Dionysiuskommentare," pp. 30, 31, 36, and 38, points out the skill with which Hugh explicated the essence of Dionysius' meaning, while Erigenia often remained on the level of a purely grammatical or philological explication which missed the point at times. Cf. H. F. Dondaine, *Le corpus Dionysien de l'Universite de Paris au XIII^e^ siecle* (Rome, 1953, pp. 69 ff., for the important role which Hugh's *In hierarchiam* played in the commentary tradition of the Dionysian corpus at the University of Paris.

[3] Cf. Weisweiller, "Die Ps.-Dionysius commentare," pp. 46 ff.

> From all evidence the commentary of Hugh imposes a very personal note on the doctrine of Dionysius. He makes him support a very strong dose of evangelical vitality, certain elements of the thought of Augustine which are not negligible, and the essence of Victorine mysticism. But these statements ought not to negate completely the fact that Hugh remains, on the whole, an objective and faithful commentator.[1]

It remained for Richard of St. Victor, introduced to Dionysius via Hugh's In hierarchiam, to develop in a thorough manner the major Dionysian themes in the context of his treatises on the contemplative life.[2] Richard used Dionysian thought in a far more vital way than Hugh himself had ever used it. Hugh's commentary on the Celestial Hierarchy was not without effect upon his thought, however, as we shall observe in the course of our analyses in Chapters III and IV.

---

1. "Connaissance de Dieu," p. 364.

2. Kirchberger, Richard of Saint-Victor, p. 48. In the course of this introduction to a translation of some of Richard's contemplative writings, Kirschberger provides an excellent analysis of Richard's relationship to Hugh, the Dionysian tradition and later mystical writers.

Within the compass of two treatises which employ the theme of the Ark of Noah Hugh gave expression to his basic conception of the contemplative life and also revealed his constant appreciation of the fundamental role of history within the Christian religion and in relation to the contemplative life. These two works are entitled, in the Migne edition, *De arca Noe morali* and *De arca Noe mystica*.[1] Our reference will be by these titles. In the *Indiculum* published by de Ghellinck the treatises have other titles. *De arca Noe morali* is there called *De triplici Archa Noe, pro Archa sapiencie cum Archa ecclesie et Archa matris gracie*,[2] while *De arca Noe mystica* receives the simple title *De Archa Noe*.[3] This latter treatise is also found in the manuscripts entitled *De pictura arcae*,[4] a very apt title, since the treatise is a description of a drawing of the Ark of Noah.

---

[1] The text of *De arca Noe morali* is found in MPL 176:617-680. An English translation will be found in *Hugh of St. Victor: Selected Spiritual Writings*, trans. by a Religious of C.S.M.V., with an Introduction by Aelred Squire (London, 1962). The division of the treatise into chapters in the translation differs from that of the Migne text and has been adopted in our references. Further citations of the treatise will be by the title *A. morl*. followed by Book and Chapter according to the English text, then the Migne reference and finally the page in the English translation, cited as Sq. Any references to the introduction to the work will be cited Squire, *SSW*. The text of *De arca Noe mystica* is found in MPL 176:681-704.

[2] Cf. *Indiculum*, I, 35; de Ghellinck, "La table," pp. 280 and 287 f.

[3] Cf. *Indiculum*, I, 34; de Ghellinck, "La table," pp. 279 f. and 288.

[4] Noted by Squire, *SSW*, p. 11.

The Migne text, which is a reprint of the Rouen edition of 1648, is the only available Latin text of the treatises.[1] It is generally acceptable, but suffers from the omission of a brief but instructive paragraph at the conclusion of _De arca Noe morali_. The passage has been restored in the English translation which we have used.[2]

The relative chronological order of the two treatises can be established with some confidence from internal evidence. They form one of the few fixed relationships in the delicate task of determining the chronological order of Hugh's writings.[3] In addition a _terminus ad quem_ for the date of _De arca Noe mystica_ can be fixed.

In Chapter XII _De arca Noe mystica_ contains a reference to the moral treatise on the Ark: "These things I discussed fully in that book which I wrote concerning the Ark."[4] The things referred to are the four modes of going out by means of contemplation. Hugh's only discussion of these is in _De arca Noe morali_, II, 5-7.[5] Consequently, one must conclude that _De arca Noe mystica_ was the second of the treatises to be written.

---

[1] For a critical bibliography of printed editions of Hugh's works, cf. Baron, _Sci. et Sg._, pp. 231-233.

[2] Cf. _A. morl._, IV, 21, Sq., p. 153. The Latin text of the omission may be found in C. C. Mierow, "A Description of Manuscript Garrett Deposit 1450, Princeton University Library, together with a Collation of the First Work Contained in It, the De Arca Noe of Hugo de Sancto Victore," _Transactions of the American Library Institute, for 1917_ (Chicago, 1918), pp. 27-55.

[3] In matters of dating Hugh's works the conclusions of van den Eynde, _Essai_, are to be preferred to those of Baron, _Sci. et Sg._, pp. xliii-l, and _Études_, pp. 69-89. The essay on authenticity in _Études_, pp. 31-67, is very useful.

[4] MPL 176:698D.

[5] MPL 176:637C-639C, Sq., pp. 77-80.

The list of Popes in *De arca Noe mystica* makes it possible to establish a date for that work.[1] The list concludes with Honorius II who died on February 14, 1130. The list must have been compiled prior to the election of his successor, so the *latest* possible date for the composition of the work is 1129/30. Innocent's elevation to the Papacy took place in 1125, so the treatise might be dated from that year, but Baron and van den Eynde both prefer to date the treatise close to 1130.[2]

Internal references also make it possible to relate the two Ark treatises to other works by Hugh, *De tribus diebus*[3] and *De vanitate mundi*.[4] The latter of these works may be said to form a trilogy with the two works which we are studying, since it also makes use of the theme of the Ark of Noah.[1] In De vanitate mundi Hugh cut short a discussion of the Ark by noting that "in another book which we have composed concerning the Ark we have said many things which ought not to be recapitulated here."[2] The reference is ambiguous, but probably ought to be taken as directing the reader to De arca Noe mystica.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Chap. III, MPL 176:687BD.

[2] Cf. van den Eynde, *Essai*, p. 80, and R. Baron, *Études sur Hugues de Saint-Victor* (Bruges, 1963), pp. 85-87.

[3] Text printed as Bk. VII of the *Didascalicon* by Migne, cf. 176:811-838. It appears as a separate work in the *Indiculum*, II, 35; de Ghellinck, "La table," pp. 281 and 391 f. Cf. also R. Baron, "Hugues de Saint-Victor: Contribution a un nouvel examen de son oeuvre," *Traditio*, XV (1959), 223-97, esp. p. 273 where reasons for attachment to the *Didascalicon* are considered. This article is an exhaustive study of MSS of Hugh's works in European libraries. Cf. the same author's "Étude sur l'authenticité de l'oeuvre de Hugues de Saint-Victor d'après les MSS Paris Ma. 717, BN 14506, et Douai 360-366," *Scriptorium*, X (1956), 182-220.

[4] Text in MPL 176:703-740. Critical text of Books I and II in Karl Müller, ed., *Hugo von St. Victor: Soliloquium de arrha animae und De vanitate mundi* ("Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen," No. 123; Bonn, 1923), pp. 26-48. The first two books are trans. with omissions in *Hugh of St. Victor: Selected Spiritual Writings*, trans. by a Religious of C.S.M.V., pp. 157-82. Cited hereafter as *DVM*, with Migne reference, page of Müller text, and page of Eng. trans. following in that order. The Müller text of *Soliloquium de arrha animae* has been trans. as *Hugh of St. Victor: Soliloquy on the Earnest Money of the Soul*, trans. Kevin Herbert (Mediaeval Philosophical Texts in Translation," No. 9; Milwaukee, Wisc., 1956).

In De arca Noe mystica Hugh pointed out to the reader that he should refer to an earlier work entitled De tribus diebus for a fuller explication of the manifestation of God's power, wisdom, and goodness by the created order.[4] This makes another chronological correlation possible, with van den Eynde placing the treatise earlier than both of the works on the Ark.[5]

This unusual set of cross-references provided by our Victorine canon thus enables these four works to be brought into a chronological series. We have, from earliest to latest: De tribus diebus, De arca Noe morali, De arca Noe mystica, De vanitate mundi. With the Ark treatises dated in the vicinity of 1130 this places the series in the first half of Hugh's career.

---

[1] DVM has been the subject of a penetrating study by H. R. Schlette, Die Nichtigkeit der Welt: Der philosophische Horizont des Hugo von St. Viktor (München, 1961). Cited hereafter as Schlette, Nichtigkeit.

[2] Bk. II, MPL 176:717D, Müller, p. 44.

[3] Cf. van den Eynde, Essai, p. 70.

[4] Cf. A. myst., VII, MPL 176:693D.

[5] Cf. Essai, p. 67.

The fact that Hugh returned to the Ark theme several times indicates that it had a particular attraction for him.[1] In the works on the Ark we see the vital use of a Biblical symbol to convey a clearly articulated conception of the present state of mankind and the way of God with man. One of Hugh's most recent interpreters has said of Hugh's use of the Ark symbol:

> The whole thing is, one may say, in modern psychological language, a kind of mandala. It both expresses and objectifies an inner experience of the world of scripture and theology and suggests how one may begin to make such an experience an interior reality.[2]

---

[1] Another reference to the Ark and Flood themes is found in a very short text entitled *Quid vere diligendum sit* which has been published by Baron, "Rapports entre saint Augustin et Hugues de Saint-Victor: trois opuscules de Hugues de Saint-Victor," *Revue des études Augustiniennes*, IV (1959), 391-429, cf. esp. pp. 424-25 and 424-29. Hereafter cited as Baron, "Rapports."

[2] Squire, *SSW*, p. 32.

CHAPTER I

History, Exegesis, and the Liturgy

In introducing students to the correct method of reading sacred scripture, Hugh of St. Victor informed them that,

> sacred scripture has three ways of conveying meaning, namely history, allegory, and tropology.[1]

Hugh voiced a fundamental presupposition of medieval exegesis. Medieval commentators, following the path traced out by their predecessors in the patristic period, were convinced that the sacred text had more than one level of meaning. Exegetes united essentially to the man in declaring that beyond the "letter" of the text, the interpreter would find a "spiritual" meaning.[2] As Hugh said, "The historical sense . . . covers mystical meanings beneath the veil of the letter."[3] Exegetes likened the relationship of literal and spiritual senses to the visible humanity and the invisible divinity of Christ,[4] or to the meat found within the shell of a nut.[1] Hugh liked the figure of the sweet honey of allegory hidden within the dry wax of the honeycomb.[2]

---

[1] *Did.*, V, 2, Butt., p. 95, Tay., p. 120.

[2] Cf. Smalley, *SBMA*, p. 1: "If, in rare moments of scepticism, a medieval scholar questioned the truth of Scripture, he never doubted that it had letter and spirit; he only feared that the spirit might be bad." Origen had pointed the way: "Everything in Scripture has a spiritual meaning, but not all of it has a literal meaning." *De princ.*, IV, iii, 5. On Origen's hermenutic, cf. *infra*.

[3] *A. morl.*, I, 10, MPL 176:624C, Sq., p. 56.

[4] Cf. Claudius of Turin, *Prol. in Lev.*, MPL 104:617. Smalley, *SBMA*, p. 1, n. 1, observes Claudius quoted Origen, *Hom. in Lev.*, I, 1. Cf. H. de Lubac, *Exégèse médiévale: Les quatre sens de l'Écriture* (2 vols. in 4; Paris, 1959-1962) for a study of the senses. Cited hereafter as de Lubac, *EM*.

It is the purpose of this chapter to elucidate the manner in which Hugh of St. Victor formulated his understanding of the three senses of Scripture and to see the way in which this formulation functioned within the total context of his thought. Hugh has been viewed as both a conservative and an innovator in the development of medieval hermenutics.[3] In truth, he was something of both, for he was willing to embark upon a program of bold innovation with far-reaching implications, all undertaken in the interest of preserving the ancient monastic tradition of lectio divina. The way in which this took place will become clear as we proceed.

In order to understand Hugh's position and the nature of his contribution to the development of hermenutics we must sketch a background composed of at least three essential elements: The patristic foundations; the early medieval developments; and the situation as it existed in the early twelfth century. To each of these situations we turn briefly.

---

[1] Cf. C. Spicq, Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exegese latine au moyen age (Paris, 1944).

[2] Cf. Did., VI, 3, Butt., p. 116, Tay., p. 138. Cf. Raban Maur, De universo, XXII, 1, MPL 111:594C: "Divine Scripture is a honeycomb filled with the honey of spiritual wisdom." Cited, Taylor, Did., p. 223, n. 8. Hugh intended no denigration of the literal sense in this analogy; it was meant to point out the necessary supportive role of the literal sense vis-à-vis allegory. Cf. infra.

[3] De Lubac considers Hugh's work as essentially conservative; Cf. EM, II, i, chap. IV; esp. p. 288: "His reflective thought and his effective practice are in great part simply very traditional." And p. 340, where Hugh's assertion of the value of the historical sense of scripture is characterized as a vocation "in reality more defensive than offensive; it was essentially conservative." On the other hand, Smalley, SBMA, chap. III, views Hugh as effecting a new departure in exegesis, esp. in "making the letter a proper subject for study, . . ." Cf. p. 97. Cf. the comment of Squire, SSW, p. 22, n. 2: "H. de Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale [II, i, chap. IV], would appear to be written largely as a criticism of the position of Miss Smalley." Of great importance in this consideration are the contributions of M-D. Chenu, TDS, chaps. III and VIII, cf. esp. pp. 64ff. (on historia) and 200ff. (on allegoria).

Medieval exegesis was traditional. It was molded thoroughly by the hermenutic and commentary tradition which developed in the burst of creative thought of the patristic period. This is true of both the form and the content of medieval exegesis, especially in the early period.[1] In the twelfth century some efforts to depart from the patterns laid down by the fathers were visible in works, for instance, by Richard of St. Victor and Rupert of Deutz. Richard took up Ezekiel's vision of the Temple and expounded it literally, whereas Gregory the Great had given only a mystical interpretation and the tradition had followed his lead. Richard was bent on correcting Gregory's neglect of the letter, for "times have changed; our attitude to the letter nowadays is different."[2] Rupert also gave evidence of an independent spirit with respect to patristic exegesis, a point of view which "scandalized his contemporaries."[3] Our concern now, however, is with the general outline of the patristic tradition which shaped the medieval attitude toward scripture.

If the fathers and their followers were agreed that beyond the literal sense of Scripture a deeper meaning existed, there was nevertheless a great degree of fluidity in the formulation of the various senses, or categories of deeper meaning, to be found in Scripture.[1] By the twelfth century a general consensus had emerged, and the number of senses was set at four. Only Hugh of St. Victor and those who followed him in a three-fold division were major dissenters.

---

[1] "All interpretation of Scripture was characterized above all by a sense of tradition, and more precisely by a fidelity firm, rigorous, and often servile to patristic exegesis, in its principles, its methods, and its conclusions." Spicq, Esquisse, p. 10, with reference to the eighth to eleventh centuries.

[2] Cf. Smalley, SBMA, pp. 108ff. For de Lubac's "reply" cf. EM, II, i, 387-403.

[3] Spicq, Esquisse, p. 116.

The Venerable Bede formulated the scheme of the four senses destined to become classic in the later tradition.[2] According to him, the four senses were history, allegory, tropology, and anagogy. Such a scheme yielded a three-fold spiritual sense. Bede defined the four senses as follows:

> It is history when according to the letter a thing is referred to in plain language as having been done or said. . . . It is allegory when by mystical words or mystical things, present mysteries (*praesentia sacramenta*) of Christ and the Church are signified. . . . Tropology, i.e. *moralis locutio*, is concerned with the establishment and correction of morals, whether declared by the obvious or the figurative [meaning] of words. . . . Anagogy i.e. *ad superiora ducens*, is a manner of speech which discusses those things concerning future rewards and matters of the future life which is in heaven, whether by means of the mystical or the obvious [meaning] of words.[3]

Bede gave an example for each of the four senses. *Historia* meant the the narration of past events, as when we read that after the Hebrew people were delivered from Egypt they built a tabernacle for the Lord in the desert. *Allegoria* included both prophetic metaphor and the typological relationship of events in the Old Testament to matters concerning Christ and His Church, to judge from the examples given first of allegory based on words (prophetic metaphor) and on things (typology).[1]

---

[1] Cf. the all-embracing survey by de Lubac, *EM*, I, i and ii. Cf. also, H. Caplan, "The Four Senses of Scriptural Interpretation and the Medieval Theory of Preaching," *Speculum*, IV (1929), 282-90; Smalley, *SBMA*, chaps. I and II; and H. de Lubac, "Sur un vieux distique: La doctrine du 'quadruple sens'," *Mélanges offert au Ferdinand Cavallera*, pp. 347-66.

[2] "The text of Bede . . . reproduced by Raban Maur (P.L. 108, 147) is the one with the most manifest influence." Paré, *et al*, *La renaissance*, p. 221, n. 1.

[3] *De tabernaculo et vasis ejus*, I, vi, MPL 91:410BD.

Tropologia revealed the ambivalence of the exegetical tradition toward the senses. Bede made it clear that a tropological meaning may be found in the open, or literal, sense of the words of a passage as well as in the figurative interpretation of a text.[2] In the twelfth-century this distinction between literal and figurative tropology is found in the commentaries of Stephen Langton.[3]

In Bede's definition of anagogy we find the same use of an anagogical meaning which may be found in the literal meaning of the text and an anagogical interpretation of a text by the elicitation of a deeper meaning. If we read "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God" (Matt. 5:8), this is "open" anagogy. Only mystical interpretation will yield an anagogical meaning from this passage: "Blessed are those who wash their robes, that they may have the right to the tree of life and that they may enter the city by the gates." (Rev. 22:14) Interpreted anagogically, this means, "Blessed are those who purify thoughts and actions so that they will have the power to

---

1. "By words, as Isaiah says: 'There shall come forth a shoot from the stump of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots.' (Is. 11:1) Said openly, this means: The Virgin Mary was born from the lineage of David, and Christ was descended from his lineage. By things, however, when the people delivered from Egyptian servitude by the blood of the Lamb signifies the church freed from the dominion of the devil by the passion of Christ." Ibid., 410C.

2. "Open" tropology is found in I John 3:18, "Little children, let us not love in word or speech but in deed and in truth." "Figurative" tropology is found in Eccl. 9:8: "Let your garments by always white; let not oil be lacking on your head." Bede gives the tropological interpretation: "Your works ought to be pure at all times, and charity ought never to be lacking in your heart." De tabernacule, I, vi, 410CD.

3. "From the morality that pertains to the mystical exposition Langton distinguishes the 'moralitas iuxta litteram.' By this he understands any lesson which the commentator may extract from the literal significance of his text." B. Smalley, Stephen Langton and the Four Senses of Scripture," Speculum, VI (1931), 64.

see the Lord Christ, . . ."[1]

This use of the terms tropologia and anagogia to represent both the literal sense of some passages and the figurative interpretation of others is the indication of a certain ambivalence in the tradition. The four senses could refer "both to the subject matter of Scripture and to the method of its exposition."[2] The generally accepted use of the senses was, however, to distinguish them not as four types of texts, but as four levels of interpretation of the same text, history being the literal sense while allegory, tropology, and anagogy formed a tripartite division of the spiritual sense or deeper meaning inherent in the text.[3] Any or all senses might be found in the same passage.

As representative of the twelfth-century we may take Guibert of Nogent. In his treatise on preaching, Guibert presents an abbreviated form of Bede's quadripartite scheme, adding the standard example of the four-fold exposition of "Jerusalem."

> There are four rules of Scripture on which every sacred page revolves as if on wheels; that is, the historical, which relates deeds that have happened; the allegorical, in which one thing is understood from another; the tropological, that is, moral discourse in which the establishment and regulating of morals is discussed; the anagogical, namely, spiritual understanding through which as we are about to deal with the highest and heavenly things we are led to still higher. For example, Jerusalem is a certain city, historically speaking; allegorically, it represents holy church; tropologically that is, morally, it is the faithful soul of anyone who sighs for a

---

1. De tabernaculo, I, vi, MPL 91:410D.

2. Smalley, SBMA, 88.

3. Cf. de Lubac, EM, I, i, 186.

> vision of eternal peace; anagogically, it means the life of the heavenly citizens who see the God of gods when his face is revealed in Zion.[1]

A simple rhymed couplet served to sum up succinctly the medieval attitude toward the function of the four senses of Scripture in the life of the Christian:

> The letter teaches deeds; allegory, what to believe;
> The moral sense, what to do; anagogy, what to strive for.[2]

The four-fold structure of the senses and the use of the example of Jerusalem both derive ultimately from Cassian. But the genesis of the multiple senses of scripture lies much earlier in the history of Christianity and has roots outside the tradition as well. As de Lubac has shown, all of the various notions of the senses of Scripture which emerged in the course of the patristic and medieval period had a common source.[3] That source was in the work of the brilliant Alexandrian exegete, Origen. Since Hugh's hermenutic was formulated in light of this tradition, we turn now to consider the development of the principles of patristic exegesis, and in particular the idea of the multiple senses.

Origen was the father of the systematic exegesis of the Bible in Christian circles and was the first father of the Church "whose interpretation of Scripture we can survey and judge fully."[1] There were commentators before Origen, but the great Alexandrian,

---

[1] Guibert of Nogent, "How to Make a Sermon," in Early Medieval Theology, trans. and ed. George E. McCracken ("Library of Christian Classics," vol. IX; Philadelphia, 1957), p. 291. Cf. MPL 156:25D.

[2] As cited by H. Caplan, "The Four Senses of Scripture Interpretation," p. 286:

> Littera gesta docet, quid credas allegoria,
> Moralis quid agas, quo tendas anagogia.

He notes speres often appears for tendas. Cf. H. de Lubac, "Sur un vieux distique: La doctrine du 'quadruple sens'," Mélanges offerts au Ferdinand Cavallera, pp. 347-66.

[3] EM, I, i, 198ff.

> brought the whole weight of contemporary scholarship--linguistic, critical, and philosophical--to bear upon the task of making the biblical commentary a permanent literary form for Christian writers, and he succeeded brilliantly.[2]

With Origen's contributions to philology and textual criticism we are not concerned here, save to note his concern to establish an accurate text and to clarify its meaning.[3] It is his formulation of the multiple senses of Scripture and his hermenutic to which we give our attention.

Origen consistently distinguished three senses of meaning in Scripture. They were the historical, the mystical or allegorical, and the moral, later called the tropological. In the course of commenting on the story of the Flood in Genesis, Origen pointed out the three senses:

> The first explanation was historical, and as it was at the bottom it served as the foundation. The second, the mystical one, which reached to a higher level, was the first floor. I will now try to add a third explanation if I can, the moral one.[4]

Interpreting the narrative according to the historical sense, Origen considered the dimensions of the Ark and the sufficiency of the size of the vessel with respect to the load it was to carry. The mystical exposition continued by showing the way in which the Ark was a figure of Christ. Finally the moral exposition related the deeper meaning of the text to the individual. By fleeing perishable things and building an Ark of faith, charity, and hope in the heart a man sets his hope on his true home in heaven.[1]

---

[1] R. C. P. Hanson, Allegory and Event. A study of the sources and significance of Origen's interpretation of scripture (London, 1959), p. 359. For other major studies of Origen's exegesis, cf. J. Daniélou, Origen, trans. Walter Mitchell (London, 1955); H. de Lubac, Histoire et Ésprit. L'intelligence de l'Écriture d'après Origene ("Theologie," vol. XXIV; Paris, 1950); and H. A. Wolfson, The Philosophy of the Church Fathers, Vol. I: Faith, Trinity, Incarnation (2nd ed. rev.; Cambridge, Mass., 1964), pp. 57 ff. Cf. the numerous refs. to Origen in de Lubac, EM, passim.

[2] Hanson, Allegory, p. 360.

[3] On Origen's contributions at this point, cf. ibid., pp. 162 ff., and Daniélou, Origen, pp. 133 ff. Also, cf. R. C. P. Hanson, Origen's Doctrine of Tradition (London, 1954).

[4] Homil. in Gen., II, 6. Trans. via Daniélou, Origen, p. 188. Cf. also de Lubac, EM, I, i, 201 f.

In this example we see that the mystical (or allegorical) sense embodied the concepts of the divine economy of salvation and of a sense of Biblical history in establishing a typology. The mystical sense concerned Christ and His Church as foreshadowed in the Old Testament. The moral exposition, on the other hand, was related to the individual and involved the spiritual struggles and advancement of the Christian, embracing all facets of the Christian life from simple morality to mysticism. In establishing these two categories of the deeper, spiritual meaning of Scripture, Origen set the tone for all succeeding patristic and medieval exegetes.[2]

Origen also paralleled the three senses with tripartite human nature. The simple are edified by the body of scripture, the obvious meaning. Those having made some progress are edified by the soul. Those who are perfect are edified by the spirit of the Scripture, which is the "shadow of the blessings to come."[3]

> Man is composed of body, soul and spirit, and the structure of Scripture has been planned by God for man's salvation in the same way.[4]

---

[1] Cf. Daniélou, Origen, p. 188.

[2] Cf. de Lubac, EM, I, i, chaps. II and III, esp. pp. 198-207; also, ibid., I, ii, pp. 415-23.

[3] Cf. De principiis, IV, ii, 4, trans. taken from Daniélou, Origen, p. 188. Cf. Origen, On First Principles, trans. with introd. and notes by G. W. Butterworth (London, 1936), pp. 275 ff.

[4] Ibid. For a balanced appraisal of Origen's debt to Philo, excluded from our discussion, cf. Hanson, Allegory, chap. 9.

Following Origen in spirit if not in language Jerome also formulated a three-fold pattern of the senses of Scripture:

> In our heart, the distribution and pattern of Scriptures are three-fold: First we understand them according to history; second, according to tropology; third, according to spiritual understanding.[1]

Jerome's significant contribution to medieval exegesis came in connection with the literal sense, through his careful exposition and his provision of numerous aids for literal exegesis.[2] Jerome did not neglect the spiritual senses, however. "St. Jerome left a tradition on the one hand of fanciful spiritual, on the other of scholarly literal interpretation. Medieval students could take their choice."[3]

Cassian, a contemporary of Jerome, presented a clearly articulated four-fold scheme of the senses in his *Conferences*.[4] He distinguished historical interpretation (*historica interpretatio*) and spiritual understanding (*intellignetia spiritalis*) in consonance with the tradition. The latter he divided into *tropologia*, *allegorica*, and *anagoge*.[1] This was the formula of Origen with the mystical sense separated into two parts, allegory and anagogy. The former dealt with historical prophecy and typology. The latter concerned the prefiguring of heavenly or eschatological matters. Tropology related to moral exposition.

---

[1] *In Ezech.*, XVI, 30, 31, MPL 25:147. Cf. *In Amos*, IV, 4, MPL 25:1027, and Ep. CXX, 12, MPL 22:1005, as cited in Pare, *et al*, *La renaissance*, p. 221, n. 1.

[2] On Jerome's contributions, cf. Smalley, *SBMA*, 20-22, and de Lubac, *EM*, II, i, chap. III, "Une lignée hiéronymienne?" In addition to Jerome's commentaries, we may cite several dossiers for which he was responsible. They aided greatly when little Hebrew was known: *Liber de nominibus hebraicis*, MPL 23:771-858, and *Quaestiones hebraicae in Genesim*, MPL se, 985-1062. He also translated and expanded a work by Eusebius, *Liber de situ et nominibus locorum hebraicorum*. Cf. *DTC*, VIII, 913.

[3] Smalley, *SBMA*, p. 22.

[4] Cf. Dom E. Pichery, ed. and trans., *Conferences* (3 vols.; "Sources Chretiennes," vols. 53-55; Paris, 1953-59). For Cassian's life and teachings, cf. H. Chadwick, *John Cassian* (Cambridge, 1950), and L. Cristiani, *Cassien* (2 vols.; Abbaye de Saint-Wandrille, 1946). Cf. also the important article by M. Olphe-Galliard, "Cassien," *DdS*, II, i, 214-76, with bibliography. Cf. also the collection of texts by Jean-Claude Guy, *Jean Cassien. Vie et doctrine spirituelle*. ("Théologie, Pastorale et Spiritualite, Recherches et Syntheses," vol. IX; Paris, 1961).

Augustine remained outside the mainstream of the tradition of the multiple senses, if we consider only his schematic.[2] He distinguished four senses: *Historia*; *aetiologia*, considering causes; *analogia*, seeking congruence of Old and New Testaments; *allegoria*, or figurative interpretation.[3] These were of little influence. Augustine's hermenutic, however, dominated the medieval period through his treatise *De doctrina christiana* in which he was content with the general distinction of literal and figurative meanings.[4]

Gregory the Great returned to the original triadic scheme as presented by Origen. In his *Moralia in Job* Gregory offered an example of the consistent application of the three senses of history, allegory, and tropology to the exposition of Biblical material. In addition, the letter prefaced to the commentary set forth Gregory's hermenutical theory.

By analogy to the construction of a building, Gregory sought to clarify the relationship and interdependence of the senses:

---

1. *Conf.*, XIV, viii, ed. Pichery, II, 189ff.

2. Cf. de Lubac, *EM*, I, i, 177-87 for a consideration of Augustine's place in the development.

3. Cf. *De utilitate credendi*, III, 5-6, MPL 42:68. *De Genesi ad litteram*, I, i, 1, MPL 24:247 enabled exegetes from Bede to Aquinas to claim Augustinian sanction for the traditional four senses. The patronage was not solidly founded on the true sense of the passage. Cf. de Lubac, *EM*, I, i, 182f.

4. Cf. our consideration of Augustine's hermenutic in connection with that of Hugh of St. Victor, *infra*.

> First, we lay the foundations in history; then by following a symbolic sense, we erect an intellectual edifice to be a stronghold of faith; and lastly be the grace of moral instruction, we as it were paint the fabric in fair colors.[1]

As we shall see, Hugh took up this construction motif and employed it with skill to a great advantage.

Gregory reminds us that the exegetical tradition did not seek to force every passage into a three-fold pattern of meaning.

> But be it known that there are some parts, which we go through in a historical exposition, some we trace out in allegory upon an investigation of the typical meaning, some we open in the lessons of moral teaching alone, allegorically conveyed, while there are some few which, with more particular care, we search out in all these ways together, exploring them in a threefold method.[2]

Gregory took the literal sense of scripture seriously. He admonished those who would neglect it:

> But sometimes, he who neglects to interpret the historical form of words according to the letter, keeps that light of truth concealed which is presented to him, and in laboriously seeking to find in them a further interior meaning, he loses that which he might easily obtain on the outside.[3]

At times Gregory passed over the letter of Scripture, because of the greater importance of the "hidden meanings" or because the passage was clear in the literal sense.[4] There were also passages which were simply incomprehensible, or impossible, if taken in their literal sense.[1] Like other patristic writers, Gregory turned to spiritual interpretation in the face of perplexity with the literal, affirming the divine intent to provide nourishment in all of Scripture.[2]

---

[1] Mor., Ep. miss., iii, MPL 75:513C. This trans. and following from A Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church. Cf. Morales sur Job, ed. et trans. R. Gillet ("Sources chretiennes," vol. 32; Paris, 1952). On Gregory's exegesis, cf. the numerous references in de Lubac, EM; also, F. Holmes Dudden, Gregory the Great. His Place in History and Thought (2 vols.; London, 1905), I, 192ff.

[2] Mor., Ep. miss., iii.

[3] Ibid., iv.

[4] On the importance of hidden meanings, cf. In Ez., I, xiii and II, viii, MPL 76:260 and 1027A. On the clarity of the literal sense, cf. Mor., Ep. miss., iii, and XVI, IV, 4, MPL 75:513 and 1122C.

With Gregory we reach the end of the creative period of patristic exegesis. The commentators who followed him relied in the main upon the fathers for their basic orientation. The general features of medieval exegesis would be controlled by the patristic heritage summed up particularly in the theory of Augustine and the practical exegetical work of Gregory.[3]

What the fathers did for the form of exegetical practice through the idea of the multiple senses of scripture they also accomplished for the content of medieval exegesis. The succeeding generations of commentators after Gregory are notable mainly for their ability to extract and digest the works of their predecessors.

> To study the commentaries of Alcuin, Claudius of Turin, Raban Maur and Walafrid Strabo his pupil, to mention outstanding names, is simply to study their sources.[4]

The groundwork for such undertakings was laid by such men as Cassiodorus,

---

[1] Mor., Ep. miss., iii, MPL 75:513D.

[2] The idea that all scripture must be edifying goes back to Origen, who got it from Philo. Cf. Danielou, Origen, pp. 179ff. Traditionally these difficulties were held to have been placed there by divine intent to force men to understand the text spiritually. The Bible spoke openly for the simple and in hidden meaning for the wise. Cf. Origen, In Numb., XIII, 3; Augustine, De doct. chr., II, vi, 7-8; Gregory, Morl., Ep. miss., iv; cited via de Lubac, EM, I, ii, 475-78.

[3] Spicq, Esquisse, p. 11. De Lubac speaks of "le moyen age gregorien," stressing the "preponderant influence exercised by Saint Gregory; . . ." EM, I, ii, 537-48.

[4] Smalley, SBMA, pp. 37f. Cf. Spicq, Esquisse, pp. 10ff.

Isidore of Seville and Bede. Cassiodorus moved toward a selective appropriation of the patristic heritage in his Institutues as he recommended select commentaries for each Biblical book.[1] Isidore gathered the fruits of classical antiquity and the rich harvest of patristic erudition into the ordered cadences of his Etymologiae.[2] Bede, finally, set the pattern for compiling Biblical commentaries by collecting extracts from the fathers.[3] In his meticulous manner Bede clearly indicated his sources, something emulated by a later complier, Raban Maur, but a trait soon ignored. Bede, Miss Smalley concludes,

> affected medieval scholarship in two ways; he made a wide range of authors readily accessible and he set an example of eager curiosity in their use.[4]

Raban Maur, the "Praeceptor of Germany," prefaced his commentary on the Books of Kings with the statement that he had attempted to bring together "the diverse statements of the fathers on the history of the Kings."[5] Like his model Bede, Raban was more than a mechanical compiler of extracts. He provided resumes of longer extracts and also included his own opinions in the commentaries.[6] In the third book of De clericorum institutione Raban provided a resume of Augustine's hermenutic as extracted from De doctrina christiana.[1] Thus the diffusion of Augustine's hermenutic was strengthened.

---

[1] Cf. MPL 70:1149-1219; cf. esp. cap. X.

[2] Cf. MPL 82:73-184.

[3] Spicq, Esquisse, pp. 29-32 has a good resume of Bede's place in the history of exegesis. Cf. also Smalley, SBMA, pp. 35f., and the collection of essays Bede: his Life, Times, and Writings, ed. A. Hamilton Thompson (Oxford, 1935).

[4] SBMA, p. 36.

[5] Praef. in libr. Reg., MPL 109:9.

[6] On the commentaries by Raban, cf. the study by J. B. Hablitzel, "Hrabanus Maurus. Ein Beitrag aur Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Exegese," Biblische Studien, XI, iii heft (1906), 1-105.

Following the example set by Bede and Raban Maur many less illustrious figures took up the task of gathering extracts from the fathers. Never before had men been so assiduous in gleaning the harvest from the field of patristic wisdom. To quote Miss Smalley, "Picking flowers in the garden of the Fathers . . . had never been done so systematically. . . ."[2] This was an essentially conservative and uncreative undertaking. But it had at least one important result. It was a period in which one could accurately speak of the "rarity and dearness of books."[3] Yet the collections made it such that "a beginner could read almost any one of the biblical books with the help of a commentary pieced together from one or more of the Fathers."[4]

Something of a renewal of Biblical studies occurred in the Carolingian period. Miss Smalley has pointed out the renewed interest in linguistics, historical exegesis, and discussion of disputed points. One may note the work of Paschasius Radbertus, Erugenia, Christian of Stavelot, Alcuin, Theodulf of Orleans, Bruno of Segni, Raban Maur and others.[5] With the death of Remigius of Auxerre in 908 the creative impulse was spent and "there is no important commentary, and a dearth even of compilations, for about a century and a quarter."[1]

---

[1] Cf. MPL 107:383ff., and Spicq, Esquisse, pp. 16ff. and 38ff.

[2] SBMA, p. 37.

[3] Spicq, Esquisse, p. 13.

[4] Smalley, SBMA, p. 38.

[5] Ibid., pp. 38-46. Cf. Spicq, Esquisse, pp. 33f. and 39-56; also, de Lubac, EM, II, i, chapter III, "Lignée hiéronymienne?"

This ongoing process of appropriating the heritage of patristic exegesis in both its form and content meant that the fundamental presuppositions of patristic exegesis continued to inform medieval practice. Close study makes it apparent, however, that in appropriating this heritage, which in itself was not uniform but was composed of many points of view with common elements, the medieval commentators and compilers tended to amplify, contract, and otherwise distort certain features. It is this important question of a gradual shift of emphasis within the tradition which brings us to the second background element to be considered in connection with the hermenutic of Hugh of St. Victor.

In the process of collecting extracts which we have noted there was a tendency toward a contraction of acknowledged points of view and a preselection of authoritative material from the fathers.[2] The availability of patristic resources had its severe drawbacks when viewed from this point of view. During the Carolingian period another factor began to emerge in the study of the Bible. Even with the isolated examples of concern for the literal sense of the text which have been noted above, there was a definite shift in the climate of Biblical exegesis in the direction of an emphasis upon allegorical interpretation.[3]

This increased attention to the allegorical sense, at the expense of the literal sense, served to upset the balance which the fathers had established between the senses of Scripture. Spicq has suggested that this shift was due to a lack of the necessary linguistic, historical, and critical tools necessary for carrying out meaningful literal exegesis.[1] It is also very possible that a symbolic frame of mind came increasingly to dominate the age, for we also find the liturgy being "allegorized" at this time by Amalarius of Metz.[2]

---

[1] Smalley, SBMA, p. 44.

[2] On the development of the process of compiling florilegia, cf. Grabmann, GSM, I, 183ff.; de Ghellinck, MT, pp. 20ff., cf. esp. p. 20 on the selectivity and bias; Paré, et al, La renaissance, pp. 242ff.

[3] Cf. Spicq, Esquisse, p. 16, who characterizes the exegesis of the eighth to the eleventh centuries, with few exceptions, as "an exégèse essentially and universally allegorical."

An instructive example of this tendency to neglect the literal sense can be found in the tradition of gathering extracts from the Moralia in Job of Gregory the Great.[3] The general practice was to neglect all the exegesis except the moral exposition. This was a far cry from the practice of Gregory himself. He had followed the general practice of taking a text and giving a three-fold exposition of the passage before passing on to the next text. As we observed earlier, this was a general pattern, not a rigidly imposed schematic. It was only with the abbreviated version of the Moralia produced by William of Champeaux in the twelfth century that we find a condensed version which really remained true to the Gregorian spirit of exegesis.[4] William followed Gregory's pattern, reproducing, in abbreviated form, Gregory's multiple exposition of one passage before going on to the next. Perhaps

---

1. Cf. Spicq, Esquisse, pp. 14-16. Cf. C. Spicq, "Pourquoi le Moyen-Age n'a-t-il pas davantage pratique l'exégèse litterale?," Rev. des Sc. Philos. et Theol., XXX (1941-42), 169-79.

2. De ecclesiasticis Officiis, MPL 105:985-1242.

3. For this paragraph, cf. Wasselynck, L'influence, esp. pp. 129ff. Also, idem., "Les compilations des 'Moralia in Job' du VII^e au XII^e siècle," RTAM, XXIX (1962), 5-32.

4. Cf. Wasselynck, L'influence, pp. 369ff. for William's abbreviation of the commentary on Job 1:1. The work, Liber florum moralium, has never been edited. It is MS. Troyes 935.

Hugh of St. Victor derived some of his dedication to the balance between the senses from this work of William who had founded the Abbey of St. Victor.

Allegory itself underwent a certain dilation. It became more and more a literary exercise. The persons, places, objects, animals, and events in Scripture were approached from a literary point of view, interested in the absolute symbolic function of these discrete, individualized objects. The historical sinews of the biblical text, presupposed by the typological orientation of traditional allegory, evaporated like a mist in the face of this new approach. Allegory was now concerned with elucidating support for doctrinal positions or with providing material keyed for an immediate homiletical purpose. It tended toward complete independence from the flow of the Biblical narrative. The practice remained oblivious to the context, historical or otherwise, of the material.[1] As M.-D. Chenu has said:

> For a long time in the West the allegorization of Scripture had been presented as the application of a symbolism essentially literary or (pseudo-) scientific. The stone, the animals, the colors, the perfumes, the numbers lent themselves to certain "significations" suggested by their forms, their properties, whether true or false, their functions, their poetic resources. Lapidaires, Beastiaries, and all the other repertories, compiled from the residue of antique science, such as the famous Physiologus, or under the cover of summary observation, furnished literary cliches which were applied to the words of the Bible, whatever their context might be, or--what is even more--whatever the historical-doctrinal frame in which the literal sense might be set. Without doubt the grand typology of the economy of the Old Testament remained in application, but it was submerged by this artificial and heterogeneous excess. The Carolingian Renaissance had furnished this technique, this pseudo-technique . . . in its treatment of figures and tropes.[2]

---

[1] "Instead of placing the text in its chronological, historical, moral, or religious context, [the exegete] sought in each case an absolute and universal rule for thought and action, which was clearly unable to take into account the nuances of the original." Spicq, Esquisse, p. 21.

[2] Chenu, TDS, p. 205.

It was this Carolingian development, and not the 'Gregorian tradition,' which provoked Hugh's strictures against improper allegory. In seeing a Victorine reaction to the "...Gregorian tradition with its sublime disregard for the letter of Scripture,"[1] as the motive for Hugh's emphases, Miss Smalley has laid the excesses of a later age at the door of Gregory the Great. The excessive emphasis upon allegory and the concurrent neglect of the literal sense of the text were a result of the developments in the Carolingian period. Gregory, like the fathers in general, had a sincere appreciation for the literal sense of scripture, while also being possessed of strong attachment to the spiritual senses.[2]

We now come to the third element which formed an essential part of the twelfth century background against which Hugh of St. Victor must be viewed. The element was the concrete situation existing in the schools of Paris and in other centers of the newly emerging scholastic theology. By the eleventh century the impetus in education had shifted from the cloister to the cathedral schools, with the exception of Bec under Lanfranc and Anselm.[3] "The office of the monk is to pray, not to teach." So wrote Ivo of Chartres,

---

1. SBMA, p. 95; on Gregory, ibid., pp. 32-35. Miss Smalley is not alone: Cf. Spicq, Esquisse, p. 42: The great fomenter of this ignorance [of the literal sense], outside of the lack of ability in this period which did not have the knowledge to extract the riches of patristic thought, was St. Gregory, . . ."

2. Cf. the study by Wasselynck, L'influence, esp. his conclusions, pp. 201-06.

3. Cf. Smalley, SBMA, p. 46. On the suppression of external schools and the decline of internal schools in monasteries, esp. with ref. to the twelfth century, cf. Delhaye, "L'organization scolaire," pp. 229-38. For a brief characterization of the various schools in the twelfth century, cf. Haskins, Renaissance, chap. II.

borrowing a "slogan" from Jerome.[1] Men everywhere agreed.[2]

In addition to the shift in locus there was a corresponding shift in the climate of studies. This is not the place to explore the ramifications of this in detail.[3] For our purposes one characteristic is of fundamental importance. This was the tendency to divorce the critical enquiry involved in the formulation, discussion, and resolution of doctrinal questions from the matrix of lectio divina. Along with this developing split was the movement toward an absolutely "objective" treatment of the Biblical text and doctrinal matters. Both of these changes reflect a radical departure from the tradition of studies characteristic of monastic life.

Leclercq and Chenu have clearly shown the bifurcation of twelfth century thought into two juxtaposed milieux, the secular schools and the monasteries.[4] These two milieux produced two theologies, the scholastic and the monastic. Chatillon has suggested, with good cause, that the climate at St. Victor, committed to the canonical life, produced a theology which might well be called canonical, distinguishing it from that of the Benedictine and reform cloisters and from that emanating from the nascent secular schools.[5]

---

1. Ivo, Ep. 36, MPL 162:48, cited by Delhaye, "L'organization scolaire," p. 215, n. 21.

2. Cf. Hugh of St. Victor, Did., V, 8, Butt., pp. 108f., Tay., p. 131: "The simplicity of the monk is his philosophy. . . . Yours is not to teach but to weep." Cf. Bernard of Clarvaux, Epp. 88 and 89, MPL 182:218, 222: "The monk is not to teach but to mourn."

3. Again, cf. Delhaye, "L'organization scolaire." Cf. the studies listed below; also, Forest, et al, Le mouvement doctrinal, pp. 69 ff.

4. Chenu, TDS, pp. 323-50, esp. 343-50, "Théologie monastique, théologie scholastique"; Leclercq, LLDG, pp. 189-231. Also, cf. Smalley, SBMA, chap. II, esp. pp. 66-83; de Ghellinck, MT, pp. 113-203; and Paré, et al, La renaissance, pp. 204-312.

5. "Une ecclésiologie," p. 411.

Monastic theology was characterized by the Biblical and liturgical setting in which the life of the monk was ordered.[1] It was, above all, a context in which the acquisition and dissemination of knowledge were oriented toward the needs of the individual as he pursued the course of his own spiritual development and toward the needs of the monastic community at large. Monastic learning was characterized by reading (*lectio*), meditation (*meditatio*), and prayer (*oratio*), the first and last of these being both communal and private activities. Contemplation (*contemplatio*) marked the fruition of this disciplined correlation of learning and asceticism.[2]

Scholastic theology, on the other hand, tended to become more and more objective in its methods and goals.[3] It was concerned with elucidating the truths of the Christian religion in an impersonal and universal manner.[4] Theology was well along the way to becoming a "science." Peter the Chanter set the tone of the schools in describing the three duties of the *magister*. He was expected to read (*legere*), dispute (*disputare*), and preach (*predicare*). He explains the text which serves as the basis of instruction; he solves the questions raised by the text; and he preaches to the faithful.[5]

Both monastic and scholastic theologies took Scripture as the start-

---

1. Cf. esp. Leclercq, *LLDG*, pp. 189ff.

2. Cf. the exposition of these elements of "benedictine asceticism" by U. Berlière, *L'ascèse bénédictine des origines à la fin du XII^{e} siècle. Essai historique*. (Paris, 1927), pp. 169-233.

3. Chenu, *TDS*, 344f. Cf. *idem*, *Saint Thomas*, pp. 236ff., and *La théologie comme science au XIII^{e} siècle* ("Bibliotheque Thomiste," XXXIII; Paris, 1957).

4. Leclercq, *LLDG*, p. 225.

5. Chenu, *Saint Thomas*, pp. 237ff., citing Peter the Chanter, *Verbum abbreviatum*, I, MPL 205:20.

ing point for their reflection upon the content of faith. However, it was in methodology that they again diverged. The monks continued to orient everything toward the lectio divina, the reading of scripture and the fathers. In line with the Fathers monastic theology continued to unite scripture commentary and doctrinal discussion within the fabric of one literary form. Sacra pagina and divinitas were synonymous.[1]

In the course of the eleventh century a new phenomenon occurred, with the introduction of quaestiones into commentaries in an ever increasing number. These quaestiones, which interrupted the natural flow of the commentaries, were generally doctrinal in nature, and gradually came to dominate much of the commentary material.[2] Finally collections of quaestiones were excerpted from the commentaries and circulated in a form completely independent of the Biblical lectio. Whether this occurred in the group of followers of Anselm of Laon and William of Champeaux, as Dom Lottin thinks,[3] or in the readily visible extraction of quaestiones from the commentary of Robert of Melun on the Pauline epistles, in the second quarter of the twelfth century, the general trend in the schools of the early twelfth century was clear.[4] It was toward a general divorce of Biblical lectio and the direct consideration of doctrine. The tendency was reinforced by the development of collections of sententiae, and would culminate in the work of Peter the Lombard.[5]

---

1. Pare, et al., La renaissance, p. 307.

2. Cf. Smalley, SBMA, pp. 73 ff.

3. Cf. supra, pp. 27 f.

4. Cf. Smalley, SBMA, pp. 74 f.

5. Cf. de Ghellinck, MT, for the definitive study of the Lombard's work and the developments leading up to it in exegesis, theology, and canon law.

Having sketched the three-fold background of patristic foundations, post-gregorian developments, and twelfth-century conditions let us now turn to Hugh's own position. The Hugonian hermenutic was expounded in two works: the _Didascalicon_ and _De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris, praenotatunculae_.[1]

The _Didascalicon_ was one of Hugh's earliest writings. Van den Eynde holds that among Hugh's major works, only the literal commentary on the Octateuch should be dated prior to it.[2] On an absolute time scale, this places the _Didascalicon_ sometime before 1125. _De scripturis_ followed the _Didascalicon_ by several years. It was written in the period 1125 to 1130/31, between the two Ark treatises. Again, this follows van den Eynde's chronology.[3] Baron inclines toward a reverse order for the works, but in so doing he neglects the work of Weisweiller.[4] Weisweiller has shown that _De scrip-_

---

[1] In the _Did._, cf. esp. Bks. IV-VI, Butt., pp. 70 ff., Tay., pp. 102 ff. In _DSSS_, cf. esp. Chaps. I-V and XIII-XVIII, MPL 175:9-15 and 20-28. Cf. also _DS_, I, prol., 4-7, MPL 176:184C-186D, Def., pp. 5 ff., and _De tribus maximis circumstantiis gestorum_, ed. W. M. Green, "Hugo of St. Victor: De tribus maximis circumstantiis gestorum," _Speculum_ XVIII (1949), 484-93, cf. esp. text, p. 491, ll. 3-33. On Hugh's hermenutic, there are numerous works to consult; in the main cf. Smalley, _SBMA_, pp. 83-106; de Lubac, _EM_, II, i, chaps. IV and V; Paré, _et al_, _La renaissance_, pp. 218-39; Baron, _Sci. et Sg._, pp. 97-124; and H. P. Pollitt, "Hugh of St. Victor as Biblical Exegete" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Sheffield, Eng., 1960).

[2] Cf. _Essai_, pp. 40-45.

[3] _Ibid._, pp. 45, 50, 71, 75, and 78 f. Cf. also the chronology on p. 112. Van den Eynde builds upon the fundamental work of Weisweiller, "Die Einflussphäre," pp. 570 ff., cf. esp. pp. 570-72 and the table and remarks on p. 571 showing the relationship of chaps. 4-13 of _DSSS_ to portions of the _Did._ Hauréau, _Les oeuvres_, pp. 1 ff., contended that the parallels from _Did._ were inserted by a later hand and that _DSSS_ was first written as an introduction to the literal commentary on the Octateuch, cf. _ibid._, p. 2.

[4] Cf. Baron, _Sci. et Sg._, p. xlvii, n. 23. It is typical of Baron that he makes no real use of Weisweiller's work. Baron, "Le 'sacrament de la for' selon Hugues de Saint-Victor," _RSPT_, XLII (1968), 50-78, was written as if the author had no knowledge of Weisweiller's earlier penetrating analysis in "_Sacramentum fidei_".

turis utilized material from the Didascalicon and from the Reportatio of Laurentius, in some cases joining the two excerpts directly.[1] This would support the posterior position of the Didascalicon. It is far more likely that Hugh combined two earlier treatises in a later work than that he parceled out portions of one treatise unequally, without parallels, in two later works. A second supporting argument is the absence of the distinction of the two works of creation and restoration in the Didascalicon. If Hugh had been accustomed to the use of this distinctive category at the time the Didascalicon was written he surely would have employed it. It is found in De scripturis.[2]

The absence of the category of the two works in the Didascalicon is most obvious in Hugh's treatment of the difference between the nature of Sacred Scripture and the writings of the philosophers. In the Didascalicon the notion of canonicity formed the only criterion for distinguishing these two types of literature.

> Sacred Scriptures are those which were produced by men who cultivated the catholic faith and which the authority of the universal church has taken over to be included among the Sacred Books and preserved to be read for the strengthening of that same faith.[3]

Thus, at the time the Didascalicon was written, Hugh was unable to frame an adequate criterion of distinction based upon the content of Scripture. He asserted Scriptures contained no error, unlike the writings of the philosophers which he characterized as "a whitewashed wall of clay, (boasting) an attractive surface all shining with eloquence . . . nevertheless, by mixing falsehoods with it, they conceal the clay of error."[1] Yet he also affirmed, "Neither all nor only those writings which treat of God or of invisible goods are to be called sacred."[2] Paradoxically, the philosophers argue plausibly about the eternity of God, the immortality of the soul, and eternal rewards and punishments while in the Old and New Testaments "the collection is devoted almost entirely to the state of this present life and to deeds done in time. . . ."[3] Only the canon can provide the adequate selective principle. There is no internal indication: "But very likely more can be shown by enumerating these writings than by defining them."[4]

---

[1] Cf. "Die Einflussphäre," pp. 570 ff.

[2] Cf. esp. chaps. I and II, MPL 175:9-11.

[3] Did., IV, 1, Butt., p. 70, Tay., p. 102.

In De scripturis the approach changed. The truth of Scripture and the error of the philosophers were duly noted. The philosophers may have knowledge and teach ethics, but they fail to commend knowledge of and love of God.[5] However, the primary criterion is that of the content of Scripture and of the writings of the philosophers. The material of sacred scripture is the work of restoration (opus restaúrationis). The subject matter of the philosophers is the work of creation (opus conditionis), i.e., the visible world.[6] Thus in the motif of the two works, Hugh found an adequate criterion for distinguishing the sacred writings of scripture from the writings of

---

1. Did., IV, 1, Butt., p. 70, Tay., p. 102.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. DSSS, I, MPL 175:9-11A.

6. Ibid., II, 11AD. This portion of De script. was derived from the Reportatio of Laurentius, cf. Weisweiller, "Zur Einflussphäre," p. 573. This distinction also marks an advance in the positive appreciation of the value of the historical element in the Scriptures.

the philosophers without absolute dependence on the criterion of canonicity.

In defining the Biblical canon Hugh followed the authority of Jerome and rejected Augustine's view by excluding the deuterocanonical books from the canon.[1] The Old Testament numbered twenty-two books; the New Testament, eight, for a total of thirty. The number of Old Testament books was especially significant, for it equalled the number of letters of the Hebrew alphabet: "So that the just may be instructed to salvation by the same number of books as is that of the letters by which the tongue of learners is instructed in speech."[2]

The books of each testament were divided into three groups.[3] The partition of the Old Testament was traditional: The Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographers. To parallel the Old Testament, Hugh divided the New into the Gospel, the Apostles, and the Fathers.[4] Under the rubric of "the Fathers" Hugh included the Decretals and the Fathers of the Church:

---

[1] Cf. Did., IV, 2, Butt., pp. 71 ff., Tay., pp. 103 ff. Cf. parallel in DSSS, VI, MPL 175:15A-16B. On the authority of Jerome, against Augustine, Hugh excluded the five deuterocanonical books (The Wisdom of Solomon, the Book of Jesus Son of Sirach, the Book of Judith, the Book of Tobias, and the Books of the Maccabees) from the canon. "They are read, to be sure, but . . . are not included in the canon." Cf. Baron, Sci. et Sg., p. 103, and Taylor, Did., p. 217 f. nn. 4 and 33; also, C. Spicq, "Le Canon des Livres Saints au XIIIe siècle," RSPT, XXXI (1942), 426-38, esp. pp. 426-27.

[2] DS, I, prol., 7, MPL 176:185D-186, Def., pp. 6 f. Cf. Did., IV, 8, Butt., p. 83, Tay., p. 111. Hugh quotes Jerome, In libros Samuel et Malachim, MPL 28:551A-552A.

[3] Cf. Did., IV, 2, Butt., pp. 71 ff., Tay., pp. 103 ff. and parallel in DSSS, VI, MPL 175:15A-16B. This was a new departure, although Baron, Sci. et Sg., p. 104, finds precedents.

[4] The parallel is made specific in DSSS, VI, MPL 175:16B: "In these orders, the great resemblance (maxime convenientia) of the two Testaments appears: After the law the prophets, and after the prophets the hagiographers; likewise, after the Evangelists the apostles, and after the apostles the doctors succeed in order." Just above, in col. 16A Hugh brought the fathers into conjunction with the deuterocanonical books, for both are read but not counted in the canon.

> In the third group, first place is held by the Decretals, which we call canons, or rules; the second, by the writings of the holy fathers and Doctors of the Church--Jerome, Augustine, Gregory, Ambrose, Isidore, Origen, Bede, and many other orthodox authors.[1]

The Fathers were included because,

> although they are not approved by the authority of the universal church, nevertheless they pass for Sacred Scriptures, both because they do not depart from the catholic faith and because they teach many useful matters.[1a]

They were not included in the canon of Scripture, however, because they lacked the authority of the universal church and because they "add nothing" to the body of Scripture.[2]

Although the fact of symmetry and a predilection for triads probably had some influence, a basic attitude toward the writings of the Fathers formed the ultimate rationale for the inclusion of the writings of the Fathers at this point.[3] The Fathers were inspired by the same Holy Spirit which inspired the writers of the canonical scriptures.[1] Hence the later writers may be numbered among the sacred and inspired authors, although they may not be counted in the canon.[2]

---

[1] *Did.*, IV, 2, Butt., p. 72, Tay., p. 104. In succeeding chaps. of the *Did.* Hugh elaborated on the authors and names of the canonical books, on the canons of councils (distinguishing them from the "canons" or Gospel tables), the principle canons, and the *authentici*, or fathers to be accorded authority. On the inclusion of the fathers in "Sacred Scripture," cf. Ott, "Hugo von St. Viktor," pp. 181 ff. Hugh's delimitation of the *äuthentici* in *Did.*, IV, 14, Butt., pp. 88 f., Tay., pp. 115 f., was derived largely from the pseudo-Gelesian decretal, IV, ii, 180 ff., ed. E. von Dobschütz, in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, XXXVIII (1912), 36 f.; cf. Ott, pp. 185 ff., who agrees that Hugh knew the decretal via Ivo of Chartres, *Panormia*, II, 91. On the meaning of the term *authentici* and the concept of authority in the twelfth century Cf. Chenu, *TDS*, chap. XVI; Ghellinck, *MT*, pp. 474 ff.; and Paré, *et al*, *La renaissance*, pp. 147 f.

[1a] *Did.*, IV, 1, Butt., pp. 70 f., Tay., p. 103.

[2] On the authority of the universal church as the basis for the canon, cf. *Did.*, IV, 1, Butt., p. 70, Tay., p. 120.

[3] Cf. Ott, "Hugo von St. Viktor," p. 184.

In defining the multiple senses of Scripture Hugh returned to the three-fold scheme which Gregory the Great had followed, consisting of history, allegory, and tropology. Our Victorine thus broke with the attitude prevailing in the twelfth century. The four-fold scheme of history, allegory, tropology, and anagogy had become well-nigh dominant. Any attempt to find in Hugh's writings a four-fold scheme like that of Bede or Guibert of Nogent in which there are four independent senses must inevitably force the

---

1. Cf. *DS*, II, xi, 13, MPL 176:505D, Def., p. 352: "It is worthy that we venerate in every respect the words of the saints in so far as we can and that we believe that whatever has been said by them is true, in whom and through whom the Spirit of truth has spoken." The context makes it unambiguous that Hugh here equates saints with patristic authorities. On the inspiration of the Fathers by the Holy Spirit, the comment of Gregory Thaumaturgus on Origen's ability to expound Scripture, "I do not think he could have done that unless he had had the Spirit of God in him, for the same grace is needed for understanding the prophecies as for making them. No one can understand the prophets unless the Spirit who inspired the prophets himself gives him understanding of his words." *Or. Paneg.*, 16, MPG 10:1093. Cited via Danielou, *Origen*, p. 158. Also, cf. the miniature from the lost codex of the *Registrum Gregorii* presented by Archbishop Egbert to the Cathedral of Trier ca. 983. The miniature depicts a dove on Gregory's shoulder as the Pope dictates to a scribe. The dove symbolized inspiration by the Holy Spirit. Cf. John Beckwith, *Early Medieval Art* (New York, 1964), p. 103 and ill. 83. The miniature is found unnumbered in the collection of the Stadtbibliothek, Trier. The miniature was apparently based on an incident recorded in Paul the Deacon's *Vita Gregorii Magni*, chap. xxviii. According to Dudden, *Gregory*, I, xii, who follows Grisar and Bethmann, this is part of an interpolated section composed of supposed miracles connected with Gregory.

2. As Chenu points out, *TDS*, p. 355, for the compilers of collections of sentences in the Middle Ages, "the *auctoritas* of Gregory, or Augustine does not signify the personal value of Gregory or of Augustine, but it designates a text of Gregory or of Augustine."

Victorine material out of shape.[1] In two places Hugh mentioned an anagogical sense, but it appeared as a sub-class of allegory and not as an independent Biblical sense.[2]

To illustrate the three-fold exposition of a single passage, Hugh drew his example from the Book of Job.[3] According to the historical sense, Job was a man of the land of Hus who, once rich, has now fallen into so much misery that he sits upon a dunghill scraping the sores on his body with a potsherd. Interpreted according to the allegorical sense, we find that:

> Job, which is interpreted "sorrowing," signifies Christ, who, once coequal with his Father in divine glory, descends to our misery and sits in humility on the dungheap of this world, sharing in all of our defects save that of sin.[4]

According to the tropological sense, by which something signifies what we ought to do, Job is able to signify the just or penitent soul.

---

[1] Typical of this tendency is the recent attempt to show the Hugonian authorship of a text found with a group of extracts of authentic Hugonian materials in MSS. Evreux 19 and Rouen 553. The text gives the four senses of Scripture in the traditional form. After noting the usual practice of Hugh in giving a three-fold scheme of the senses, Lottin turns to the Reportatio, where allegory is divided into "simple allegory" and anagogy. This shows, says Lottin, that "the text of MS. Evreux 19 is a faithful reflection of the reported teaching of Hugh of St. Victor." This completely overlooks the subordinate place of anagogy, in addition to the fact that for Hugh anagogy is not an eschatological sense as it is in the anonymous text Lottin cites, but refers to cases in which "visible things lead us to the understanding of things which are not visible" without any necessary reference to celestial or eschatological matters. Cf. O. Lottin, "Quelques reçueils," pp. 275 f.; the text in question appears in MS. Evreux 19, f. 141^{r} and MS. Rouen 553, f. 135va-135^{vb}.

[2] Cf. DSSS, III, MPL 176:12B, and Reportatio, f. 134^{vb}-135ra as cited by Lottin, "Quelques reçueils," p. 276.

[3] Cf. DSSS, III, MPL 175:12BC.

[4] Ibid., 12BC.

> Job is able to signify the just or penitent soul, who composes in his memory a dungheap from all of the sins which he has committed, and not for a short while but with perseverance "sitting" upon this and meditating, he does not cease to weep.[1]

Hugh adopted the Gregorian metaphor of the construction of a house to describe the relationship between the senses.[2] History was the laying of the foundation; allegory, the erection of the walls; tropology, in conclusion, the beautification of the house with an overspread of color. In Gregory's hands the construction metaphor had served to express the way in which the senses were related within the process of expounding the Biblical text. For Hugh the metaphor retained this meaning, but more important was the new significance which Hugh derived from the construction motif in conjunction with his conception of the Biblical senses as distinct disciplines. The proper method of studying the Bible is like a process of construction, because a series of disciplines must be mastered. Hugh perceived that the senses of Scripture furnished the pattern for this course of study:

> First of all, the student of Sacred Scripture ought to look among history, allegory, and tropology for that order sought in the disciplines--that is, he should ask which of these three precedes the others in the order of study.
>
> In this question it is not without value to call to mind what we see happen in the construction of buildings, where first the foundation is laid, then the structure is raised upon it, and finally, when the work is finished, the house is decorated by the laying on of color.[3]

It will be most advantageous for our study to look at each of these disciplines separately in the order which Hugh proposed. First we turn to history.

---

[1] Cf. DSSS, III, MPL 175:12C.

[2] Did., IV, 2, Butt., p. 113, Tay., p. 135; cf. Gregory the Great, Mor., Ep. miss., iii, quoted supra, p. 49.

[3] Did., IV, 2, Butt., p. 113, Tay., p. 135.

In the *Didascalicon* Hugh defined *historia* as,

> the truth of the deeds that have been performed . . . what has been done, when it has been done, where it has been done, and by whom it has been done.[1]

Thus the student of history ought to give his attention to the mastery of four things in particular when he reads the sacred text, namely, the person, the things which have happened, the times and the places in which they have happened. These are the raw material of history in any age.

In *De scripturis* Hugh also drew upon a definition of history bequeathed from antiquity via Isidore. The definition was etymological and emphasized the eyewitness aspect of history: "*Historia* is so called from the Greek word ἱστορέω, i.e., *historeo*, which is 'I see' and 'I narrate' (*quod est video et narro*)."[2]

Both of the above definitions clearly relate *historia* as a Biblical sense to the narration of things that have happened. This may be called the narrow definition of history, for Hugh proposed a second definition of the term in which the meaning of the historical sense of Scripture was expanded to include the obvious, literal meaning of the text, whatever form it might take.

> But if we take the meaning of the word more broadly, it is not unfitting that we call by the name "history" not only the recounting of actual deeds but also the first meaning of any narrative which uses words according to their proper nature.[3]

In *De sacramentis christianae fidei* Hugh effected a synthesis of the narrative and literal aspects of the "historical" sense of Scripture:

---

[1] Bk. VI, 3, Butt., pp. 113 f., Tay., p. 136.

[2] Chap. III, MPL 175:12A. Cf. Isidore, *Etym.*, I, xli, MPL 82:122B, where the definition occurs in the section *De grammatica*. Isidore emphasized the eyewitness aspect; cf. I, xliv, col. 122A.

[3] *Did.*, VI, 3, Butt., pp. 115 f., Tay., p. 137. Cf. *DSSS*, III, MPL 175:11.

> History is the narration of deeds done, expressed by the first signification of the letter.[1]

This broad, inclusive definition of historia may be correlated with the "sense" of a passage, which Hugh takes to be the second level of exposition:

> Sense is the ready and obvious meaning which the letter presents on the surface.[2]

The exposition of the sense of a passage was preceeded by grammatical analysis and followed by the explication of the "deeper meaning." In the case of Scripture the latter meant the allegorical and tropological interpretations which followed the historical.

For Hugh of St. Victor one of the leading characteristics of the Biblical material was its historical nature, in the sense of historical narrative:

> as we run through the series of books in the Old Testament and the New, we see that the collection is devoted almost entirely to the state of this present life and to deeds done in time . . . .[3]

The deeds recorded in Scripture with which the student ought to be concerned particularly were the deeds of God, the magnalia Dei which show the thread of the work of restoration throughout all the ages. Elsewhere Hugh called these deeds the "sacraments [mysteries] of our faith," and pointed to their typological significance.[1] The student of history was not to be concerned with eliciting the deeper mysteries of these events. His first task was the building of the foundation of history. After that he could turn to mystical interpretation, but not before.

---

[1] Bk. I, prol, 4, MPL 176:184D, Def., p. 5. This definition of historia was included in the Diffinitiones extracted from Hugh's works and collected in MS. Douai 360; cf. the edition of the text by Baron, "Hugues de Saint-Victor lexicographe," p. 127.

[2] Did., III, 8, Butt., p. 58, Tay., p. 92. The definition of "sense" is taken from the section on the liberal arts, but the meaning is the same for the exposition of any text. Scripture is one case among many, although for obvious reasons Hugh found it to be a special case. For the application to Scripture, cf. Did., VI, 8-11, Butt., pp. 125 ff., Tay., pp. 147 ff.

[3] Did., IV, 1, Butt., p. 70, Tay., p. 102.

> All things were brought forth in order; move along in order yourself. . . . I am not now saying that you should first struggle to unfold the figures of the Old Testament and penetrate its mystical sayings before you come to the Gospel streams you must drink from. But just as you see that every building lacking a foundation cannot stand firm, so also is it in learning. The foundation and principle of sacred learning, however, is history, . . .[2]

The history which the reader would find in the Bible was outlined by Hugh in a resume which in brief form foreshadowed the compendium of historical material which would be gathered together in the Chronicon in order to guide the student in the course of events in the Old and New Testaments, and by extension, in the Church. In the Didascalicon Hugh pointed out this history in the following manner:

> Read, therefore, and learn that "in the beginning God created heaven and earth." Read that in the beginning he planted "a paradise of pleasure wherein he placed man whom he had formed." Him sinning God expelled and thrust out into the trials of this life. Read how the entire offspring of the human race descended from one man; how, subsequently, flood destroyed sinners; how, in the midst of the waters, the divine mercy preserved the just man Noah with his sons; next, how Abraham received the mark of the faith, but afterwards Israel went down into Egypt; how God thereafter led the sons of Israel out of Egypt by the hand of Moses and Aaron, brought them through the Red Sea and through the desert, gave them the Law, and settled them in the land of promise; how often he delivered them as sinners into the hands of their enemies and afterwards freed them again when they were penitent; how first through judges, then through kings, he rules his people: "He took his servant David from following the ewes great with young." Solomon he enlightened with wisdom. For the weeping Ezechiel he added on fifteen years. Thereafter he sent the straying people captive into Babylon by the hand of Nabuchodonosor. After seventy years he brought them back, through Cyrus. At last, however, when

---

[1] Cf. DS, II, vi, 8, MPL 176:454C-455D, Def., pp. 295 ff.

[2] Did., VI, 3, Butt., p. 116, Tay., p. 139.

> that time was already declining, he sent his Son into our flesh, and he, having sent his apostles into all the world, promised eternal life to those who were repentant. He foretold that he would come at the end of the ages to judge us, to make a return to each man according to his deeds--namely, eternal fire for sinners, but for the just, eternal life and the kingdom of which there shall be no end. See how, from the time when the world began until the end of the ages, the mercies of God do not slacken.[1]

This passage makes it quite clear that when Hugh spoke of reading Scripture according to the historical or literal sense he meant, first of all, a type of reading which was attentive to the historical narrative. The wider meaning of historia, i.e., the obvious sense of any passage in the Bible, had an equal place in Hugh's absolute insistence upon the fundamental place of the historical sense of Scripture in exegesis. But in the Didascalicon and the preface to the Chronicon Hugh was arguing for the introduction of a discipline which would study the record of Scripture as a narratio rerum gestarum, a narrative of things that have been done.[2] This was something more than an insistance that before allegorizing a given passage, the exegete ought to comprehend the literal sense too.

The second element in the Victorine program to guide the student in his studies was the order in which books were to be read.[3] Here Hugh's insistence upon history as narrative rather than the broader sense of the obvious meaning in the text was apparent again. Concerning the order of books to be read, Hugh commented that "the same order of books is not to be kept in historical and allegorical study. History follows the order of time; to allegory belongs more the order of knowledge, . . ."[1] In enumerating the books particularly useful for the study of Scripture ad historiam Hugh enumerated them in temporal order, which in this case happened to be canonical order as well.

---

[1] Did., VI, 3, Butt., pp. 116 f., Tay., pp. 138 f.

[2] The crucial importance of history conceived as a narratio rerum gestarum in Hugh's thought has been placed in excellent perspective by Chenu, TDS, pp. 64-72.

[3] Did., VI, 3, Butt., pp. 116 ff., Tay., pp. 138 f.

> But you ask if I have any opinion about the books which are useful for this study. I think the ones to be studied most are: Genesis, Exodus, Josue, the Book of Judges, and that of Kings, and Paralipomenon; of the New Testament, first the four Gospels, then the Acts of the Apostles.[2]

Hugh consciously selected those books which have the most to do with the unfolding history of the people of the Old Testament, the life of Christ, and the development of the early Church. A comparison of this list with the list given for reading in connection with the discipline of allegory makes this clear.[3] If the word history is taken in the wider meaning of literal sense, then Hugh would recommend that all of the books of the Bible can be rightly read in connection with study ad historiam in the order "in which they were listed earlier," i.e. in canonical order.[4]

Hugh vigorously pressed the case for the necessary place of history in the study of Scripture in both the Didascalicon and De scripturis. He drew a parallel with the young student and the beginning of his education:

> Do not look down upon these least things. The man who looks down on such smallest things slips little by little. If, in the beginning, you had looked down on learning the alphabet, now you would not even find your names listed with those of the grammar students.[5]

---

[1] Did., VI, 6, Butt., p. 123, Tay., p. 145.

[2] Ibid., 3, Butt., p. 115, Tay., p. 137.

[3] Cf. infra, p. 84, for this list.

[4] Did., VI, 3, Butt., pp. 115 f., Tay., pp. 137 f.

[5] Ibid., Butt., p. 114, Tay., p. 136.

History, Hugh would admit, is a beginning. But the failure to begin in a proper manner threatens the success of later endeavors.

> I know that there are certain fellows who want to play the philosopher right away. They say that stories should be left to pseudo apostles. The knowledge of these fellows is like that of an ass. Don't imitate persons of this kind.[1]

Hugh related that he "often learned many things which seemed to others to be a sort of joke or just nonsense."[2] As a young boy he studied diligently the seven liberal arts, which were but auxiliary disciplines for the present study of Scripture.[3] Yet, the studies of a preparatory nature, "were not without their utility for me, . . ."[4]

History lacks the attraction of allegory or of "philosophizing." The student is right [illegible] ask, "I find many things in the histories which seem to be of no utility; why should I be kept busy with this sort of thing?"[5] Hugh's answer was made from the perspective of one who saw a clear hierarchy of knowing and the need for slow and careful progress in learning.

> There are indeed many things in the Scriptures which, considered in themselves, seem to have nothing worth looking for, but if you look at them in the light of the other things to which they are joined, and if you begin to weigh them in their whole context, you will see that they are as necessary as they are fitting.[6]

---

[1] Did., VI, 3, Butt., p. 114, Tay., p. 136.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., Butt., pp. 114 f., Tay., pp. 136 f. On the role of the seven liberal arts as propaedeutic to the study of Scripture, cf. DS, I, prol., v and vi, MPL 176:185, Def., p. 5.

[4] Did., VI, 3, Butt., p. 115, Tay., p. 137.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

Hugh's final admonition commended a breadth of mind:

> Learn everything; you will see afterwards that nothing is superfluous. A skimpy knowledge is not a pleasing thing.[1]

Perhaps the historical sense of the Scriptures seems earthy or dirty to those who aspire to the lofty heights of the allegorical sense. Hugh called them back to the fruitful earth with an allusion to a gospel pericope:

> Do not despise what is lowly in God's word, for by lowliness you will be enlightened to divinity. The outward form of God's word seems to you, perhaps, like dirt, so you trample it underfoot, like dirt, and despise what the letter tells you was done physically and visibly. But hear! that dirt, which you trample, opened the eyes of the blind. Read scripture then, and first learn carefully what it tells you was done in the flesh.[2]

Finally, it is nothing other than the fact of the Incarnation of the Word which gives history its value:

> The Wisdom of God Himself, except he had first been known corporally, never would have been able to illumine that blind eye of the mind [mentis acies] to that spiritual contemplation.[3]

To assist the student in his historical study of the Bible, Hugh provided an introductory handbook which he described as "a compendium on the initial instruction in Holy Scripture, which consists in their historical reading, . . ."[4] The compendium (compendiosum volumen) which Hugh prepared to introduce the historical study of Scripture has now been identified unquestionably with the Chronicon.[1] The work dates, most likely, from 1130/31.[2] The Chronicon was a massive compilation of historical material, arranged in numerous tables, for the purpose of outlining the history of man's restoration and also the relation of this history to the history of the Eastern kingdoms and to the history of the Roman empire and the people of Europe after the advent of Christ.[3] The opening table was the chronology of the "Restoration" arranged in six ages according to Hebrew chronology.[4] At the head of this table was a diagram representing the six days of creation. Thus the student, even in his study of history, was being oriented toward the major Victorine theme of the work of creation and the work of restoration. This was followed by a series of tables giving rulers of the kingdoms of the ancient world, with lengths of reigns indicated.[1] Following another table of the chronology of the Restoration, this time according to the Septuagint,[2] Hugh included several lists of significant groups of men in the Old Testament, e.g., the genealogies of the patriarchs, kings of Edom, heads of the twelve tribes, the twenty-four chiefs of the sanctuary, David's mighty men, the forty-two encampments in the wilderness, and the forty-eight cities of the Levites.[3] This section concluded with a list of the Biblical canon, following _Did._, IV, 2-7. The next table was a list of geographical names and has now been identified as Hugh's _mappa mundi_.[4] After a short fragment, "The three sisters," Hugh presented a chronology of papal succession indicating the years, months, and days of each pontificate and interregnum. Days, months, and years were tallied in separate columns, but interlinear notations of total accumulated years in the columns for elapsed days and months provided a way for the user to arrive at the true date of any pontificate. Next were tables of rulers since the time of Christ. First were the Roman and Byzantine Emperors and then kings of the Franks, Germans, etc. Brief narratives accompany many of the lists, as was the case for the lists of ancient rulers, also.[1] The next-to-last table listed historiographers. The final table was a parallel chronology of the Popes and Emperors from the Incarnation to Pope Honorius II and the emperor Henry V.[2]

---

[1] Did., VI, 3, Butt., p. 115, Tay., p. 137.

[2] DSSS, V, MPL 175:14D-15A. Trans. via Smalley, SBMA, pp. 93 f. Cf. the close parallel in Augustine, De vera relig., 1, 98.

[3] DSSS, V, MPL 175:14D.

[4] DS, I, prol., "Why he has changed the reading," MPL 176:183, Def., p. 3.

---

[1] For the identification, cf. W. M. Green, "Hugo of St. Victor, De tribus maximis circumstantiis gestorum," Speculum XVIII (1943), 486-93. The article includes an edited text of the preface to the Chronicon, entitled "De tribus maximis circumstantiis gestorum," and a summary description of the various tables comprising the Chronicon proper with notes on Hugh's sources. Portions of the Chronicon have been published; cf. the concluding list of popes and emperors, ed. G. Waitz, "Chronica quae dicitur Hugonis de Sancto Victore," MGH, SS, XXIV, 88-97; and the mappa mundi published by Baron, "Hugues de Saint-Victor lexicographe," pp. 137 ff. The authenticity of the Chronicon was first demonstrated by Haureau, Les oeuvres, pp. 184-91, against the denial by the Histoire litteraire de la France, XII, 57. On the question of authenticity and the history of the argument, cf. Baron, Sci. et Sg., p. xxviii, n. 43. The Chronicon remains unedited except for the fragments mentioned. The best MS. is BN 15009, fols. 1-40. If the MS. is not the original it is by far the most faithful copy; cf. Green, pp. 486 ff. and the reproduction of fol. 3v, the first page of tables, facing p. 492.

[2] On the problems of dating, cf. van den Eynde, Essai, pp. 90 ff. The matter is rather intricate, and we will not discuss it here.

[3] Cf. the resume in Green, "Hugo of St. Victor," pp. 492 ff., and the comment of van den Eynde, Essai, p. 92: "This work condenses, in a variety of tables, the essentials of the history of the revelation, with its principle ramifications in profane history in antiquity as well as in the Christian era."

[4] Cf. Green, "Hugo of St. Victor," p. 492 and pl. A. The table gives the series of patriarchs, judges, kings, and high priests from Adam to Agrippa Rex. Here Hugh followed Bede, except that Bede used Persian, Alexandrian, and Roman kings after the Exile while Hugh followed the line of Jewish high priests and Herodian kings. Green, p. 492, nn. 2 and 3, cites Eusebius and Syncellus as Hugh's sources for the latter.

---

[1] Cf. Green, "Hugh of St. Victor," p. 492, who gives Eusebius as chief source, with additions from Justin, Orosius, and Bede.

[2] _Ibid._, for Bede as the source.

[3] The forty-two encampments appeared in the drawing of the Ark, tracing the journey of the Exodus. Cf. _A. myst._, XIII and XIV, MPL 176:699D-700C, where Hugh indicated he intended to offer a description of the "interpretation and mystery" of the encampments in another work. He never completed it.

[4] Cf. _supra_, p. 75, n. 1.

By means of these tables Hugh intended to furnish the student with a basic digest of pertinent historical material which "will be easy to comprehend and to retain in memory."[3] With history, i.e. the literal sense of scripture, as the "foundation of all doctrine," Hugh considered the Chronicon to be a "foundation of the foundation."[4] It was a brief summary of the the gesta temporum, condensing these "well-nigh infinite" deeds because, as Hugh said, "memory rejoices in brevity."[5]

The need for such historical data was pointed out in the concluding chapter of De scripturis.[1] There Hugh noted the difficulty of properly interpreting the book of Judith without knowledge of Assyrian kings. Likewise, the books of the Maccabees and Daniel require a thorough knowledge of the succession of rulers in Syria and Egypt following Alexander the Great. Hugh concluded the chapter with almost three columns spent recounting the rulers in Palestine following the Maccabean revolt down to the time of the martyrdom of St. James.

---

[1] The brief notes which appear in the tables of rulers of the ancient kingdoms and rulers since the time of Christ often reappear in the Liber exceptionum of Richard of St. Victor. Richard also utilized the Chronicon of Hugh of Fleury as a source for compiling the historical notices. Cf. Richard de Saint-Victor, Liber Exceptionem. Texte critique avec introduction, notes et tables, publie par Jean Chatillon (Paris, 1958), pp. 68 ff. and notes to text, passim. Cited hereafter as Lib. except., ed. Chatillon. Until the work of Chatillon the Lib. excerpt. was attributed to Hugh of St. Victor. Cf. ibid., pp. 71-77, [A resume of Chatillon's earlier article, "Le contenu, l'authenticité et le contenu du Liber exceptionum et des Sermones centum de Richard de Saint-Victor," RMAL, IV (1948), 23-51 and 343-66.]

[2] Cf. Green, "Hugo of St. Victor," p. 493. Cf. Wattenbach, Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen (6th ed.; Berlin, 1894), II, 466 f.

[3] De trib. max., ed. Green, p. 491, l. 16.

[4] Ibid., l. 15. This use of foundation recalls the image of a building used in Did., VI, 2, Butt., p. 113, Tay., p. 135, to describe the relationship of the disciplines of history, allegory, and tropology. History was there called the foundation. On the traditional idea of the historical sense of scripture as a "foundation," cf. de Lubac, EM, I, ii, 435 ff.

[5] De trib. max., ed. Green, p. 491, ll. 13 f.

Hugh's Chronicon shows but part of the effort which our Victorine canon expended in behalf of literal exegesis of Scripture. As an example of his exposition of the Biblical text ad litteram, we have Hugh's Notulae on the literal sense of the Octateuch.[2] In these notes, which cover only a portion of each of the books and probably represent "only the debris of his teaching,"[3] Hugh set himself the limited task of commenting only upon the literal sense of the passages.[4] The spiritual interpretation could be added at another time; the foundation must be laid first. At the head of his notes on the Pentateuch Hugh glossed the text of Jerome's prologue Desiderii mei, a practice which became a part of the standard procedure in the schools.[5]

---

[1] Chap. XVIII, MPL 175:25-28. Cf. the opening sentence: "Many things occur in Sacred Scripture which produce difficulty in understanding through ignorance of the order in which things have been done."

[2] Adnotationes elucidatoriae, MPL 175:29-114. Cf. Spicq, Esquisse, pp. 120 f., and Smalley, SBMA, pp. 97 ff.

[3] A. Wilmart, "Le Commentaire sur le prophète Nahum attribue à Julien de Tolede," Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique de Toulouse, VII-VIII (1922), 265. Cited, Smalley, SBMA, p. 98, n. 5.

[4] Adnot. elucid. in Pent., III, MPL 175:32D-33A: "In this book two things especially will be attended to: The truth of the deeds which have been done, and the form of words."

[5] Smalley, SBMA, p. 99.

In glossing Jerome, Hugh expanded Jerome's comments on the need for a knowledge of Hebrew in order to properly interpret the Old Testament:

> If you hold that the Septuagint version is more to be approved than the Hebrew, because the Greek texts of Scripture are truer than the Hebrew, and if you hold that the Latin version is to be approved more than the Greek, you will make no progress in understanding the Old Testament Scriptures--since, on the contrary, the Greek texts are truer than the Latin, and the Hebrew texts are truer than the Greek.[1]

Hugh took his own advice, for recent studies have shown that he corrected the text of the Octateuch at least sixty times on the basis of the Hebrew text.[2] But more importantly, Hugh was in contact with followers of the great Jewish literal exegete Rashi, who lived 1030-1105.[3] Smalley and Hailperin are both convinced that Hugh was not simply reading Jewish exegesis; he was in personal contact with Jewish scholars who furnished him with the Jewish understanding of the literal sense of the Biblical texts. Hugh then made use of these Hebraic traditions in his own literal exposition.[4]

Hugh's Hebrew studies were more of a promise than a concrete achievement. We must look to a later generation at St. Victor and to Andrew of St. Victor to find an exegete who will devote himself entirely to the literal sense of Scripture and in so doing will make more extensive use of the Hebrew language and Hebrew exegesis.[1] Hugh, through Andrew, set in motion a tradition of literal exegesis which availed itself of material drawn from Rashi.[2] This tradition was to culminate in the work of Nicholas of Lyra.[3]

---

[1] Adnot. elucid. in Pent., I, MPL 175:32B. Trans. via Herman Hailperin, Rashi and the Christian Scholars (Pittsburgh, 1963), p. 106. In Did., IV, 5, Butt., pp. 75 f., Tay., p. 106, Hugh repeats the story of the divine inspiration of the seventy translators of the Septuagint. But Hugh concludes, "But Jerome says that this is a tale undeserving of belief."

[2] Cf. Hailperin, Rashi, p. 107.

[3] On Rashi, cf. Ibid., pp. 15-102.

[4] Cf. Ibid., pp. 107 ff., and Smalley, SBMA, pp. 103 ff.

In all of his many efforts directed at the cultivation of the literal, historical exegesis of Scripture and in the aids he supplied for this, Hugh succeeded in imparting a certain "weight" to history.[4] He made it important. This is not a question primarily of a clearly articulated philosophy or theology of history, although such is present in Hugh's thought.[5] Nor is it a question of what would be called "historical consciousness" today. It is mostly a question of the relative value placed upon the study of history and an appreciation of the position of that history vis-à-vis the Christian religion. In this perspective, Hugh made history a "foundation."

The notion of history as a "foundation" was present throughout the tradition.[6] But in his program of Biblical studies, in the creative use of an historical schema for his doctrinal summa, and in the role given history in "mystical" treatises such as the Ark treatises Hugh projects the image of a man embarking upon a new path.[1] Some of Hugh's innovations were new techniques, to be sure. But they reflect the birth of a new attitude.

---

[1] Cf. the excellent study by Smalley, SBMA, chap. IV, as well as her articles cited there, esp. p. 112, nn. 1 and 3. Most of Andrew's exegesis remains unedited in manuscripts.

[2] Ibid., pp. 149-195.

[3] On the interaction of Christian and Jewish scholars in the Middle Ages, cf. Hailperin, Rashi, pp. 112 ff. and on Nicholas, pp. 137 ff.

[4] Cf. Chenu, TDS, pp. 70 f.

[5] Cf. W. A. Schneider, Geschichte und Geschichtsphilosophie bei Hugo von St. Victor. ("Münsterische Beiträge zur Geschichtsforschung," III. Folge, ii Heft; Münster, 1933).

[6] Cf. de Lubac, EM, I, ii, 435 ff.

The perspective in which Hugh placed history must never be forgotten, either. History was not an independent discipline. It was part and parcel of an hierarchically ordered succession of undertakings. History was placed at the service of allegory and formed the foundation for the construction of the ediface of the faith.

Having completed the study of history, the student was then prepared to move on to the study of the Biblical text according to the allegorical sense. Hugh felt little need to urge allegory in the same way he pressed for history, for "this matter itself appears worthy enough in its own right."[2] Allegorical exposition is not something to be taken lightly, however. It requires the best that a man can give to it:

> Yet I wish you to know, good student, that this pursuit demands . . . matured mental abilities which, in the course of their searching may so restrain their subtlety as not to lose good judgment in which they discern.[3]

Strange as it seems, in the *Didascalicon* Hugh failed to give an explicit definition of allegory, despite his lengthy consideration of the topic. This is somewhat understandable in light of Hugh's concern in Book VI of the work, since he was attempting to establish and to make the case for a course of studies in connection with each of the Scriptural senses. If we turn to the later work *De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris* we find allegory defined quite clearly:

---

1. Cf. Chenu, *TDS*, pp. 181 f.

2. *Did.*, VI, 4, Butt., pp. 117 f., Tay., p. 139.

3. *Ibid.*

> It is allegory when by that which is declared by the letter something is signified as done, either in the past, the present, or the future. It is called allegoria as if from alieniloquium, because one thing is said and another thing is signified . . . .[1]

The typological aspect of Hugonian allegory is clearly present here, and it becomes more articulate in De sacramentis:

> We have allegory when, through what is said to have been done, something else is signified as done either in the past or in the present or in the future; . . .[2]

In the context of defining allegory Hugh introduces us in two instances to his only uses of anagogy with respect to the senses of Scripture.[3] In each case Hugh divided allegory into "simple allegory" (allegoria simplex) and anagogy. Simple allegory occurs when "by a visible deed another visible deed is signified."[4] Anagogy, on the other hand, occurs when "by a visible [deed] some invisible action is made known."[5] The difference in the two aspects of allegory lies in the invisibility of the action signified. The distinction, which Hugh decided to drop in the prologue to De sacramentis christianae fidei, is evidence of Hugh's sensitivity to the difference between the visible world of matter and the invisible world of spiritual realities.

---

[1] Chap. III, MPL 175:12AB. Cf. also the Reportatio of Laurentius, MS. Breslau Stadtbibl. Rehdigeranus 61, f. 134^{vb}-135^{ra}, as given by Lottin, "Quelques reçueils," p. 276. On the relationship to DSSS, cf. also Weisweiller, "Die Einflussphäre," pp. 556, 573.

[2] Book I, prol., iv, MPL 176:185A, Def., p. 5.

[3] Cf. DSSS, III, MPL 175:12BC and the Reportatio of Laurentius, cited above.

[4] Chap. III, MPL 175:12B. The text of DSSS has been emended to read "something else which is visible" rather than "invisible" as the Migne text reads. This is based on the Reportatio cited by Lottin, "Quelques recueils," p. 276.

[5] DSSS, III, MPL 175:12BC.

The use of anagogy in this context cannot readily be identified with the traditional use of anagogy, for that usage centered upon eschatological matters, as we have seen with respect to Cassian and Bede. The examples given in the Reportatio of Laurentius are instructive.[1] They make clear the contrast between the objects signified. Simple allegory remains upon the plane of observable history, as shown by the example of the lifting up of the serpent in the desert as signifying the lifting up of Christ upon the Cross. This would correspond to typology. Anagogy, while not forsaking the framework of history is nevertheless concerned with invisible realities which also mark the intersection of the eternal with the temporal. Anagogy was illustrated twice. First by the sacrament of the creation of light, signifying the "conversion of the good angels to their Creator and through conversion, illumination." In the second instance, the submersion of the Egyptians in the Red Sea signifies the washing away of all sins by the water of baptism, thus prefiguring the action of sacramental grace.

It is impossible to maintain, on the basis of the passage in De scripturis, that this "anagogy" which forms a subdivision of allegory was assimilated to tropology. Baron has so argued on the pretext that the division of allegory gives three "senses" which are then paralleled by the three-fold interpretation of Job.[2] This will not hold, since the third sense in the interpretation of Job clearly corresponds to tropology and "anagogy" never is defined as the signification of "what we ought to do."

In the final analysis the presence or absence of anagogy from the Victorine scheme of the senses must be accepted as a fact. Perhaps the best solution is offered by Miss Smalley who notes that Stephen Langton,

---

[1] Cf. f. 134^{vb}-135^{ra}; Lottin, "Quelques reçueils," p. 276.

[2] He suggests such an assimilation in Sci. et Sg., p. 111.

> uses the three-fold division of Hugh of St Victor. The anagogical sense, we may suppose, is never mentioned because it merges conveniently with the allegorical and the moral.[1]

Just as he provided a select reading list for the discipline of history, so Hugh furnished the student of allegory a list of selected books of the Bible to which he ought to apply himself. This selection of books differed substantially from the collection proposed for historia:

> If you ask what books are best for this study, I think the beginning of Genesis on the work of the six days; the three last books of Moses on the mysteries of the Law; Isaias; the beginning and end of Ezechiel; Job; the Psalter; the Canticle of Canticles; two Gospels in particular . . . Matthew and John; the Epistles of Paul; the Canonical Epistles; and the Apocalypse.[2]

From all of the books in the list Hugh singled out the Pauline Epistles for special commendation: "Even by their very number [they] show that they contain the perfection of the two Testaments."[3]

In the reading for the historical sense, Hugh had advised the student to read the Biblical books in the sequence of historical narrative. With allegory the reading order must be changed. Now the reader begins with the New Testament.[4] There the truth is clearly proclaimed. This methodology must be followed because the allegorical sense has more to do with knowledge than with the narration of history, and, for Hugh, the search for knowledge begins with that which is most clear and then moves to the more obscure matters.[1] Thus, in allegory a beginning is made by reading the clear exposition of doctrine and events in the New Testament. Then the student set about seeking the foreshadowing of Gospel truth in the Old Testament. The reason for Hugh's high evaluation of the Pauline Epistles is now clear. In Paul's writings he found the clearest expression of doctrine and also instances in which the Old Testament was interpreted typologically.

---

[1] "Stephen Langton and the Four Senses of Scripture," p. 64.

[2] Did., VI, 4, Butt., p. 123, Tay., p. 144.

[3] Ibid. Number symbolism has crept in here. There are fourteen Pauline epistles; fourteen is twice seven, the perfect number. Cf. Taylor, Did., p. 224, n. 21.

[4] Did., VI, 6, Butt., p. 123, Tay., p. 145.

In the Didascalicon, the larger part of the discussion of the discipline of allegory centered upon the need for a firm grasp of Christian doctrine as a prerequisite for allegorical exegesis.[2] This correlation of allegory and doctrine reflected the traditional view summed up in the couplet cited earlier: "Allegory teaches what we should believe."[3] In order to assist the student and provide him with a certain basic summary of Christian doctrine Hugh provided an introductory handbook for the study of allegory. The work was outlined in the Didascalicon and realized concretely in De sacramentis christianae fidei.

Hugh continued the construction motif to show the relation of this doctrinal summary to the study of Scripture. From the subterranean foundations of history spring the walls of allegory. But before the fabric of the faith may be erected, clear guidelines and a certain degree of order must be established. Hugh pointed to the work of the stonemason in moving from the laying of a foundation to the erection of the walls of a building:

---

[1] The principle that learning begins with the clear and moves to the obscure was discussed in connection with reading the arts in Did., III, 9, Butt., p. 59, Tay., p. 93.

[2] Book VI, 4, Butt., pp. 117 ff., Tay., pp. 139 ff.

[3] Cf. supra, p. 44.

> Take a look at what the mason does. When the foundation has been laid, he stretches out his string in a straight line, he drops his perpendicular, and then one by one, he lays the diligently polished stones in a row.[1]

This course of polished stones, carefully shaped, fitted in place, and leveled, forms the basis for the superstructure. Hugh proposed "something contemptible to gapers but worthy of imitation to those who understand."[2]

This series of fitted stone imposed between the foundation of history and the walls of allegory was doctrinal study:

> The very bases of your spiritual structure [of allegory] are certain principles of the faith--principles which form your starting point. Truly, the judicious student ought to be sure that, before he makes his way through extensive volumes, he is so instructed in the particulars which bear upon his task and upon his profession of true faith, that he may safely be able to build onto his structure whatever he afterwards finds.[3]

Hugh provided a summary of the polished stones which made up this "second foundation." Their order corresponds, with one exception, with the disposition of material in _De sacramentis christianae fidei_.[4] As the only change from the skeletal outline in the _Didascalicon_, Hugh added a section at the head of _De sacramentis_ treating the six days of creation.

Hugh's essential commitment to history emerges again in the architechtonics of this major theological work. In contrast to the _Sententiae_ of the School of Anselm of Leon and William of Champeaux and to the doctrinal writings of Abelard also, _De sacramentis_ was clearly structured along historical lines, using the framework of the work of creation and the work of restoration. In the paradigm of the two works and the structuring element of historical succession Hugh had a combination of principles which provided him with a thoroughly organized and synthesized work.[1]

---

[1] _Did._, VI, 4, Butt., p. 118, Tay., p. 140.

[2] _Ibid._

[3] _Ibid._, p. 119, Tay., p. 142.

[4] Cf. Paré, _et al_, _La renaissance_, pp. 259-64, and the table showing the parallels, pp. 263 ff.

Hugh's move in making the introductory study of doctrine the immediate preparation for the allegorical exposition of Scripture assumes greater significance in light of the new developments which were taking place in the schools of Leon, Paris, and elsewhere. As we have noted, a rising tide of _quaestiones_ was beginning to dominate the commentaries of the masters, while the tendency to divorce theological reflection from the context of _lectio divina_ was becoming apparent in the collections of _sententiae_ then in circulation.[2] Hugh of St. Victor determined to champion the traditional point of view that all learning ought to be subservient to the reading of Scripture, in the centuries old tradition of the monastic _lectio_. In the context of the stresses and strains which were beginning to appear in the ediface of twelfth-century education, this meant that Hugh had to attempt to fit the growing desire for a systematic treatment of Christian doctrine into a course of Biblical study. This he accomplished to his own satisfaction, if not always to that of his contemporaries, through the writing of _De sacramentis_ and by incorporating the study of such a compend of doctrine into the course of _lectio divina_ prior to the allegorical study of Scripture. _De sacramentis_ was just an introduction, however. The end of all the student's effort was still to be oriented toward the reading of the Biblical text and continual meditation upon that.[1]

---

[1] This aspect of _De sacramentis christianae fidei_ considered _supra_, pp. 25 ff.

[2] Cf. _supra_, pp. 28 and 59.

In De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris we find Hugh dealing with current abuses in the practice of the allegorical method. His opponents remained unnamed, just as they did in De sacramentis. There were men in his day who found the study of the historical sense of Scripture beneath their dignity. They were allegorists; history and the literal sense held little interest for them. Hugh presented their position and rebutted it in a lively dialogue:

> The mystical sense is only gathered from what the letter says, in the first place. I wonder how people have the face to boast themselves teachers of allegory, when they do not know the primary meaning of the letter. "We read the Scriptures," they say, "but we don't read the letter. The letter does not interest us. We teach allegory." How do you read Scripture then, if you don't read the letter? Subtract the letter and what is left? "We read the letter" they say, "but not according to the letter. We read allegory, and we expound the letter not literally but allegorically." What does it mean then to expound the letter, if not to show what the letter signifies? "But," they say, "lion means one thing according to the historical sense, another thing according to the allegorical sense. Lion according to the historical sense means a beast, but allegorically it means Christ. Therefore the word lion means Christ."[2]

Hugh continued by carefully pointing out that it is not the word lion which is the symbol of Christ the Saviour. It is only the animal lion which is able to signify Christ. "Those things which the letter signifies, are [themselves] signs of spiritual meanings."[3] This was one of Hugh's key hermenutical principles, and he had gotten it from St. Augustine.[4] This symbolic function of things, was one of the characteristics which differentiated Scripture from other writings. The symbolic value of words is of purely human origin, but the symbolic value of things takes its origin in the creative will of God.[1] People, objects, and events have a deeper meaning because God wills it.[2] The spiritual sense of the Biblical text will not be found by casting aside the letter of the text. Only by accepting the letter of the text with all the weight of its reality and then meditating upon this reality, can the eye illumined by faith penetrate into the deeper meaning of Scripture.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Baron, Sci. et Sg., pp. 97-98.

[2] DSSS, V, MPL 175:13BD. Trans., with additions, via Smalley, SBMA, p. 93. Cf. Paré, et al, La renaissance, pp. 223 ff.

[3] DSSS, V, MPL 175:13D-14A.

[4] Cf. Augustine, De doctrina christiana, I, ii; II, i; III, v ff.; MPL 34:10, 35, and 68 ff.

In attacking this abusive use of the allegorical method Hugh no doubt had in mind the general tendency, operative since the Carolingian period, to turn from literal exegesis to an increased allegorization of every detail in the text. As noted earlier this bordered upon a literary and "pseudo-scientific" exercise which resulted in the practical vaporization of the historical sinews of the Biblical narrative, the very bond which in Hugh's mind made allegory possible.[4]

Hugh may well have had another target for his quiet ridicule of the allegorists' position, however. M.-D. Chenu has pointed out the growth of a new literary genre, the Allegoriae, during the twelfth century.[1] These works were systematic presentations of all possible symbolic values for words in Scripture, often arranged in alphabetical order. They were popular in scholarly circles and were very useful for the allegorical exposition of texts with an eye toward eliciting doctrine. Again, this was a process which definitely moved away from the historical fundamentum of the Biblical text in the interests of a purely artificial interplay of symbolic elements.

---

[1] Cf. *Did.*, V, 3, Butt., pp. 96 ff., Tay., pp. 121 ff. "The significance of things is far more excellent than that of words, . . . The latter is the voice of men, the former the voice of God speaking to men." Also, cf. *DSSS*, XIV, MPL 175:20D ff.

[2] Cf. *DSSS*, XVI, MPL 175:23B: "Places have a significance, since God in definite and determinate places wills certain things to happen, for the purpose of signifying [something]: . . ."

[3] Cf. *DSSS*, V, MPL 175:14A.

[4] Cf. *supra*, pp. 55 f.

Hugh was as dedicated as anyone to the value of a symbolic theology, drawing upon the deeper meaning inherent in the Biblical text. But in his programmatic essay in the Didascalicon and in his lively exchange with the allegorists in De scripturis Hugh intended to attach his theology firmly to the realities of history in the Biblical text.[2]

After completing the study of De sacramentis and the allegorical exposition of Scripture, the student might then go on to the study of the tropological sense. This third sense of Scripture was defined by Hugh as follows:

> We have tropology when through what is said to have been done, it is signified that something ought to be done.[3]

Allegory and tropology both have to do with the mystical signification of things, but with a difference. Allegory relates to the signifying of mystical facts while tropology has to do with mystical things to be done:

---

[1] Cf. TDS, pp. 196 ff. and esp. 198 ff. A typical example of this type of collection is the Allegoriae in universam Scripturam, MPL 112:849-1088, once attributed to Raban Maur. Cf. Spicq, Esquisse, p. 39.

[2] Cf. Chenu, TDS, pp. 200-04.

[3] DS, I, prol., iv, MPL 176:184C-185A, Def., p. 5. Cf. DSSS, XVI, MPL 175:24A.

> Under that sense, however consisting in the significance of things in relation to mystical facts, allegory is contained. And under that sense, consisting in the meaning of things in relation to mystical things to be done, tropology is contained.[1]

Allegory "teaches right faith." Tropology "teaches good work."[2]

In comparing the three senses Hugh placed tropology apart from history and allegory. Rather than pressing a distinction between the literal and spiritual senses, Hugh distinguished the two senses which lead to knowledge from the sense which leads to virtue. History and allegory concern knowledge; tropology, virtue. Taken together knowledge and virtue are the two fruits of lectio divina.

> Let whoever comes to sacred reading for instruction first know what kind of fruit it yields. . . . Twofold is the fruit of sacred reading, because it either instructs the mind with knowledge or it equips it with morals. . . . Of these, the first, namely knowledge, has more to do with history and allegory, the other, namely instruction in morals, has more to do with tropology. The whole of sacred Scripture is directed to this end.[3]

This pattern had two effects. First, it increased the dignity of the historical sense of Scripture by linking history with allegory in the acquisition of knowledge.[4] Second, it implicitly placed tropology within a sphere of activity differing from that of the first two senses, which are oriented toward knowledge. Tropology was concerned with virtue, with the molding of life. Here we are brought within the context of the ancient traditional monastic lectio divina, in which "the understanding is able to have a part in the fruits of the lectio, but the direct goal of the lectio is the development of charity and devotion."[1] "Study is necessary, knowledge is useful, but above all, study and knowledge ought to form the understanding and the heart in the sense of the Christian virtues."[2]

---

[1] DS, I, prol., vi, MPL 176:185C, Def., p. 5.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Did., VI, 6, Butt., 104 f., Tay., p. 127. Cf. DSSS, XIII, MPL 175:200CD, for parallel.

[4] Cf. Smalley, SBMA, p. 89.

Hugh has again, in the discipline of tropology, effected a brilliant feat of synthesis. He has worked into the scheme of Biblical studies the meditative reading or collation of St. Gregory and Cassian.[3] The *Didascalicon* does not have any extensive treatment of tropology in the manner of the examination of history and allegory.[4] But Hugh does offer suggestions for the man who would read Scripture for the correction of morals.[5] Here we find some of Hugh's suggestions for reading Scripture *ad tropologiam*, although, again, Hugh's comments in the *Didascalicon* are not directed toward a methodology of exegesis but more toward an attitude and a "context" in which this exegesis is to be carried out, after definite preparation.

Without giving a list of books to read, Hugh suggested that:

> The man who seeks knowledge of the virtues and a way of life from the Sacred Word ought to study especially those books which urge contempt for this world and inflame the mind with love for its creator; which teach the straight road of life and show how virtues may be acquired and vices turned aside.[6]

There are two ways that this knowledge of the virtuous life may be obtained.

---

[1] Berliere, *L'ascèse bénédictine*, p. 171.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 174.

[3] Cf. Smalley, *SBMA*, p. 89.

[4] Cf. *Did.*, VI, 5, Butt., pp. 122 f., Tay., pp. 144 f., where Hugh points out that he will say nothing more about tropology than he has already said, "except that it is more the meaning of things than the meaning of words which seems to pertain to it."

[5] Cf. *Did.*, V, 7-9, Butt., pp. 105-11, Tay., pp. 128-33.

[6] *Ibid.*, 7, Butt., p. 106, Tay., p. 128.

One is by example, through reading of the examples which have been provided by saintly lives. The second is by instruction, through reading what these saints have said which deals with discipline.[1] One thinks immediately of the Victorine climate of the traditional monastic lectio in which the deeds of the saints and their words were read in the liturgy, at meals, in collations, and in private.[2]

It is Gregory the Great, Hugh continued, who is the master guide for acquiring virtue:

> Among the deeds and sayings of the saints, those marvelously written down by the most blessed Gregory should, I think, be taken to heart. Because those have seemed to me sweet beyond all others and full of the love of eternal life, I did not want to pass them over in silence.[3]

Hugh probably had two works by Gregory in mind: The Moralia in Job, and the Dialogues.[4] The first, as we have seen, was a commentary with a strong orientation toward the tropological exposition of Scripture. The latter dealt with the lives of Benedict and other saints. But Scripture also tells of the lives of the saints: "Scripture tells the deeds of the saints and excites the hearts of the weak to imitate them."[5]

Hugh carefully distinguished the two goals of sacred reading, lectio and meditatio.[6] Reading, study, and understanding--lectio and its fruit--are for the beginner. Virtue, the fruit of meditatio, follows in the life of the mature. Above all, study ought not to become a preoccupation and a search for subtle and elusive things in Scripture.[1] It is, finally, but a preparation for the molding of a life, although Hugh knows many men who read Scripture for knowledge, but not for virtue.[2]

---

[1] Cf. Did., V, 7, Butt., p. 106, Tay., p. 128.

[2] Cf. infra, pp. 107 and 114 f.

[3] Did., V, 7, Butt., p. 106, Tay., p. 128.

[4] Cf. MPL 75-76.

[5] Mor., I, MPL 75:542C.

[6] Cf. Did., praef., and V, 8, Butt., pp. 2 and 108 f., Tay., pp. 44 and 130 ff.

In the Didascalicon, lectio and meditatio were sent within the ladder of the contemplative quest. Study belongs to the beginner. Contemplation comes to the perfect. One moves gradually, by ordered steps from the former to the latter.

> There are four things in which the life of just men is now practiced and raised, as it were by certain steps, to its future perfection--namely, study or instruction, meditation, prayer, and performance. Then follows a fifth, contemplation, in which . . . one has a foretaste, even in this life, of what the future reward of good works is.[3]

It is within this ordered series of steps that Hugh would finally place the practice of Biblical lectio. Knowledge and virtue join together in the gradual ascent toward perfection in virtue and toward the knowledge and love of God brought to final fruition of the visio Dei, experienced in the foretaste, as Hugh calls it, of the contemplative experience in this life. In Hugh's first Homily on Ecclesiastes we find the ascending series of thinking, meditation, and contemplation.[1] In connection with meditation and contemplation Hugh suggested three Biblical books which particularly nourish these stages in life. They are the three books of Solomon: Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs.[2] Proverbs is for the meditating man, who is seeking out that which is hidden and pressing for the clarification of things.[3] Ecclesiastes is for the beginner in contemplation, who contemplates the visible world.[4] Ecclesiastes will teach him to view this world as "vanity of vanities." Finally, the Song of Songs provides the nourishment for the true contemplative who seeks to find the Creator, not His creation. These three books, more than any others, provide the basis for the meditative and tropological reading of Scripture.

---

[1] Cf. Hugh's description of the man who sought the subtle points in Scripture with such determination and preoccupation that he "stopped performing not only useful but even necessary acts." Did., V, 7, Butt., p. 106, Tay., p. 129. Cf. F. L. Battles, "Hugo of Saint-Victor as a Moral Allegorist," Church History, XVIII (1949), 220-40, esp. p. 226. Hugh's point is that lectio ought not to be a preoccupation but rather the means to a higher end, meditation and contemplation.

[2] Did., V, 6, Butt., p. 106, Tay., p. 129.

[3] Ibid., 9, Butt., p. 109, Tay., p. 132.

If we turn from the course of biblical studies which Hugh outlined in the Didascalicon to the correlated activity of expounding Scripture according to the various senses, we find that our Victorine canon presented an equally structured approach to that endeavor. The expositor, just as the student, must seek an order in his work.

The order of exposition proceeded in three stages: The letter, the sense, and the sententia, or the deeper meaning. This scheme of exposition

---

1. MPL 175:116D-117B., Sq., pp. 183 f.

2. Ibid., 117B, p. 184.

3. Cf. De meditatione, ed. Baron, "Rapports," pp. 406 ff. in which there are three objects for meditation, i.e., the world, Scripture, and morals. One may meditate on Scripture according to any of the three senses, says Hugh, but the thrust of this meditative practice is basically moral. Cf. De meditatione, II, 3, Baron ed., p. 407.

4. Cf. the three ways of going out by contemplation in A. morl., II, 5, MPL 176:637C ff., Sq., pp. 77 ff., in which one contemplates the world in terms of its vanity, as the gift of God, and as the means of executing God's judgment.

bore the weight of the ancient tradition of the grammarians, just as it had for Augustine.[1] Indeed, Hugh presented it first in the portion of the Didascalicon devoted to the reading of "secular literature." There he described the elements of exposition in the following manner:

> Exposition includes three things: the letter, the sense, and the inner meaning. The letter is the fit arrangement of words, which we also call construction; the sense is a certain ready and obvious meaning which the letter presents on the surface; the inner meaning is the deeper understanding which can be found only through interpretation and commentary. Among these, the order of inquiry is first the letter, then the sense, and finally the inner meaning. And when this is done, the exposition is complete.[2]

Hugh's procedure in commenting on the Celestial Hierarchies of Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite is a good example of an application of this scheme to a non-Biblical text.[3] Hugh first clarified the meaning of a short segment of the text by use of word studies and other linguistic observations. Then he presented the sense of the text, usually by means of restatement or simplified paraphrase. Next Hugh expounded the sententia, eliciting the deeper meaning of the Areopagite's work. The whole commentary proceeded in this manner, breaking the text up into small segments and expounding them in this three-fold manner.

Hugh intended for the Biblical commentator to proceed in the same way. The differences occasioned were due to the unique nature of Scripture. Unlike the writings of the philosophers and others, Scripture is primarily concerned with "deeds done in time;"[4] consequently the sense will often be historical. Also, unlike other literature, in Scripture not only do words signify things; things (res) also have a significatory function.[1] The deeper meaning (sententia) of Scripture was founded upon this significatory function of things and thus was composed of the traditional allegorical and tropological senses.

---

[1] Chenu, St. Thomas, p. 251. On the method of the grammarians and Augustine's use of it, cf. Marrou, Augustine, pp. 20-25 and 424-27.

[2] Book III, 8, Butt., p. 58, Tay., p. 92.

[3] Cf. Baron, Études, pp. 136-39, where examples are given.

[4] Cf. Did., IV, 1, Butt., p. 70, Tay., p. 102.

The letter was simply the grammatical structure of the text.[2] Although it will most likely be clear, or else need only some amplification or contraction to be clear, there will be times when unaccustomed modes of expression may hinder understanding. Odd grammatical construction may be present, such as Hebraisms which Jerome carried over into the Latin text of the Vulgate, e.g. "The Lord, in heaven the throne of Him." Expounding the letter means the clarification of matters such as this.

All texts must have a letter, i.e. they must make clear and precise linguistic sense.[3] But it is not necessary that they contain both sense and sententia together. One or the other must be present, however. If the letter has an immediate meaning, then the passage contains letter and sense. If the passage signifies things clearly, but the things signified fail to convey meaning without an added exposition, then there is only the letter and a deeper meaning.[4]

Hugh distinguished "fitting" and "unfitting" sense. By the latter he meant passages which could not be taken in their literal meaning.[5] As examples he pointed out phrases which Gregory had cited in the preface to his commentary on Job: "They have devoured Jacob." "Under whom they stoop that bear up the world." "My soul hath chosen hanging."[1] Such passages have only a deeper meaning. Yet there are also places which men have mistakenly concluded that there is no literal meaning when actually there is a very clear literal meaning. Hugh chose an example from Isaiah 4:1: "In that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying: We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel, only let us be called by thy name. Take away our reproach." Hugh pointed out that exegetes take this to be void of literal meaning and thus conclude it must be interpreted allegorically. This they do by finding a foreshadowing of Christ and the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit:

---

[1] Cf. Did., V, 3, Butt., pp. 96 f., Tay., pp. 121 f.

[2] Ibid., VI, 9, Butt., p. 126, Tay., pp. 147 ff.

[3] Ibid., 8, Butt., pp. 125 f., Tay., p. 147.

[4] Ibid., Butt., pp. 125-26, Tay., p. 147.

[5] Ibid., 10, Butt., pp. 126-27, Tay., p. 148.

> Therefore you say that the seven women are the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, and that these take hold of one man, that is Christ, . . .[2]

This allegorical interpretation had been given by Origen. It was repeated by Jerome who also furnished a literal interpretation.[3] Hugh was not simply playing Jerome off against Origen, however. Amalarius of Metz provides an interesting example of the capacity of medieval commentators to neglect literal exegesis even when available.[4] Commenting on this passage, Amalarius pointed out that it could not be understood literally and had only a figurative meaning. He then quoted excerpts from Jerome's allegorical interpretation, completely neglecting the literal. It was against abuse like this that Hugh protested.

---

[1] Cf. Gregory the Great, *Mor.*, Ep. miss. iii, MPL 75:513D.

[2] *Did.*, VI, 10, Butt., pp. 127-28, Tay., p. 149.

[3] Cf. Jerome's *Translatio homilarum Origenis in visiones Isaiae*, Homil. III, MPL 24:910 ff. For Jerome's commentary, cf. *Comm. in Isaiam proph.*, II, iv, MPL 24:72-73.

[4] Cf. *De eccl. Officibus*, MPL 105:1036B. The *Gloss* also ignored Jerome's literal exegesis for allegory; cf. MPL 113:1240D.

Hugh took account of the historical context of the passage in Isaiah, and pointed out the prophet's statement that the males would be so decimated by war that seven women would scarcely be able to find one man. Entering into the historical context in this manner, Hugh expounded a cogent interpretation of the material taken by others in a totally 'spiritual' manner. Thus Hugh set about to insist upon a careful consideration of the text, making use of whatever tools of inquiry might be at the disposal of the exegete for ascertaining the literal sense of a passage.

For the 'deeper meaning' Hugh presented general guidelines for the interpreter.[1] He began by saying it can 'never be absurd, never false.' The sense may have contradictions; the deeper sense may never have such. The latter is always harmonious and true (*congrua et vera*.) Augustine served Hugh as the final word here.[2] One must always seek the intention of the author in context; if this is impossible, the *sententia* must be consonant with sound faith. And always, one must be open to new understanding of the higher meaning of scripture, for the object of *lectio divina* is to mold one's thought with that of Scripture, and not to make Scripture conform to our own wishes.

It is clear in his analysis of the exposition of Scripture that Hugh means by the 'sense' what he has called the 'historical sense' elsewhere. By the *sententia* he means allegory and tropology. Although the historical reading of the Bible is fundamental to biblical studies, and a careful exposition of the literal sense must precede all allegory and tropology, Hugh joins the whole of the patristic and medieval tradition in asserting that one need not find all three senses in every passage. One may have history along, or allegory alone, or tropology; on occasion one may have two together and even all three. But one should never seek to force the whole of sacred scripture into the "Procrustian bed" of an omnipresent three-fold interpretation. The metaphor of a zither served Hugh to make this point, just as it had served others before his day.

---

[1] *Did.*, VI, 11, Butt., pp. 128-29, Tay., pp. 147-48.

[2] Hugh took extracts from *De Genesi ad litteram*, I, xviii and xxi, MPL 34:260 and 262.

> ...all of Sacred Scripture is so suitably adjusted that whatever is contained in it either resounds with the sweetness of spiritual understanding in the manner of strings; or, containing utterances of mysteries set here and there in the course of a historical narrative or in the substance of a literal context, and, as it were, connecting these up into one object, it binds them together all at once as the wood does which curves under the taut strings; and, receiving their sound into itself it reflects it more sweetly to our ears--a sound which the string alone has not yielded, but which the wood too has formed by the shape of its body.[1]

So the three senses of scripture join together in providing the sweet melody of the divine truth, in its multiple apprehension through history, allegory, and tropology. While Hugh stressed history and developed resources for the more accurate interpretation of the letter, he was a man incredibly attuned to the sweet notes of the spiritual senses. He was a man of the 'both/and' school. From a position of power, not from a defensive weakness, Hugh argued for the recognition of the historical structure of the Christian faith along with a firm plea that the spiritual riches of this history be clearly apprehended.

Before terminating this consideration of the senses of scripture and the role of history we should take note of the possible connection between a concern for history and regular participation in the liturgy. It is significant that the monasteries of Europe and not the cathedral schools and universities fostered a consciousness of history in the Middle Ages. It was among monks and canons regular that works of an historical nature were produced as interest in history was re-awakened in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.[1]

---

[1] Did., V, 2, Butt., pp. 95-96, Tay., p. 121.

German writers, e.g. Spörl and Schneider, have in general followed Alois Dempf by asserting that in the Middle Ages historical consciousness emerged in the circle of writers identified with *deutscher Symbolismus*.[2] This "German" mentality was opposed to the uniquely "French" mentality reflected in the static, rationalistic, Aristotelian atmosphere of the Parisian schools.[3] Schneider saw Hugh of St. Victor as the lone representative in Paris of the German school of thought.[4]

As representatives of this German symbolism, Spörl names Hildegard of Bingen, Rupert of Deutz, Honorius of Autun, and Hugh of St. Victor.[5]

---

[1] "It was almost totally by the monks that history came to life in the Middle Ages and attained its full efflorescence through their efforts." J. de Ghellinck, *L'essor de la littérature latine au XII^{e} siècle* (2 vols.; Bruxelles, 1946), II, 90. Monks must be extended to include such canons regular as Anselm of Havelberg and Hugh of St. Victor. On Anselm cf. Johannes Spörl, *Grundformen hochmittelalterlicher Geschichtsanschauung*, pp. 21-31; Chenu, *TDS*, pp. 69-89; and Alois Dempf, *Sacrum Imperium. Geschichts und Staatsphilosophie des Mittelalters* (München, 1929), pp. 241 ff.

[2] Cf. A. Dempf, *Sacrum Imperium*; Spörl, *Grundformen*, pp. 18 f.; and Schneider, *Geschichte*, pp. 10 ff.

[3] "The German Symbolism is still dynamic in its essence; its construction was grounded from the beginning in an historical manner of thinking, while Scholasticism, oriented toward Aristotle, appears more 'static' and therefore unhistorical." Spörl, *Grundformen*, p. 18 f.

[4] *Geschichte*, pp. 11 f.

[5] Cf. *Grundformen*, p. 18.

Whatever the national origin of these persons, a question still not settled for at least two of them,[1] Spörl and others have neglected an important factor which links the lives and the thought of all of these twelfth-century figures. They lived in monastic milieux, which in turn means that they participated in the regular communal celebration of the liturgy.[2] The consciousness of history manifested by these persons is best seen not as a nationalistic trait after the manner of the German scholars.[3] Such a mentality is best understood from the perspective of participation in the monastic life, centered as it was upon the Bible and the liturgy.

The traditional educational scheme of the seven liberal arts, which so decisively influenced Medieval education, had no place for the independent study of history. As was the case in classical antiquity, history remained essentially a literary form. The histories were studied under the guidance of the grammarian and the rhetor.[4] They were read for training in literary style and for purposes of moral edification. History was capable of giving insight into human nature and pointing out, by way of examples, fortunate and unfortunate events for the instruction, edification, and enjoyment of men.[1] Heir to the pedagogical scheme of the seven liberal arts, the emerging universities of the late twelfth century had no place for the study of history.[2] The scholastics showed little formal interest in the study of history.[3]

---

[1] I.e., Hugh and Honorius. On Hugh's origin, cf. supra. Honorius' origin remains shrouded in mystery, despite persistent research. Cf. the summaries of the state of the question in Eva M. Sanford, "Honorius Presbyter and Scholasticus," Speculum, XXIII (1948), 397 ff., and M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Le cosmos symbolique du XII^{e} siècle," AHDLMA, XX (1953), 32 f. Mlle. d'Alverny's comment on Honorius is to the point: "The true fatherland of a cleric is represented by the Studia which dispense sacred and profane science, and the books which they have at hand."

[2] Honorius is the only possible exception. However, recent studies indicate that it is likely that Honorius' education was at Canterbury under Anselm and that he settled at Regensburg in Southern Germany, an inclusus dependent on the Benedictine monastery of St. James. Again, a monastic context is indicated for his education and his life. Cf. Sanford and d'Alverny as cited in previous note.

[3] Spörl, Grundformen, p. 18.

[4] "Grammar was the art of 'interpreting the poets and the historians.'" Leclercq, LLDG, pp. 156 f., citing Raban Maur, De clericorum institutione, III, MPL 170:395. Cf. Leclercq, pp. 26 f. on the place of grammar in forming of the spirit of monastic learning. Also, Baron, Sci. et Sg., p. 74 notes this.

Hugh of St. Victor reflected this absence of emphasis upon history in the formal structure of Arts. For Hugh, the *historiae* find a place among these writings called "appendages" to the arts. They are to be studied only as time permits and only after the basic seven liberal arts have been mastered. The "appendages" are only tangential to philosophy.[4] Hugh also placed history, along with poetry and fables, within the discipline of grammar, as was common in the medieval period.[5]

---

[1] Chenu, *TDS*, p. 219, notes the use of Old Testament *exempla* to instruct in morals. Cf. Ph. Delhaye, "*Grammatica et Ethica* au XII^{e} siècle," *RTAM* xxv (1958), 78 ff. Delhaye notes the grammarian instructed in ethics in commenting on the texts.

[2] Spörl, *Grundformen*, p. 18.

[3] Leclercq, *LLDG*, p. 222 notes that "eschatology occupies practically no place in the teaching of Abailard." De Lubac, *EM*, I, ii, 642 quotes Yves Congar to the effect that the most serious defect of scholastic theology was its lack of an eschatological sense.

[4] *Did.*, III, 4, Butt., pp. 54 f., Tay., p. 88.

[5] *Ibid.*, II, 29, Butt., p. 45, Tay., p. 80. Cf. Isidore of Seville, *Etym.*, I, xlii ff., MPL 82:122D ff.

This history which we find tucked away amongst the 'appendages' of the arts and at the end of a long list of concerns for the grammarian is history as conceived and written by the classical authors. Biblical history is a different matter. It is the foundation of all serious exegesis and thus the foundation of all valid theology.

Several reasons for the birth of historical consciousness in monastic and canonical *milieux* have been advanced. The involvement of monks and canons in the political life of the day has been cited as one contributing factor in this awakening.[1] Anselm of Havelberg and Otto of Freising belonged to the "unusual category of religious-men-of-politics" who were consciously attempting to relate the *vita activa* of political men and the *vita contemplativa* of monastic life.[2] Anselm's diplomatic activity brought him into contact with the Eastern Church. The resulting appreciation of a divergent tradition encouraged him to reflect upon the historical development of the Church and Her teaching. With Anselm we see a positive appreciation of the mutations in structure and doctrine in the age of grace; sacred history was being extended from the Old Testament, through the New, and into the present age.[3] Otto like Anselm was involved in the movement of monastic reform sweeping Europe in the twelfth century. He viewed the panorama of mankind's history from Creation to Consummation through the Augustinian "spectacles" of the Two Cities.[1] Both men, deeply involved in the historical events of their own day, viewed the sweep of history in biblical, eschatological categories.[2]

---

[1] Chenu, *TDS*, pp. 63 f.

[2] Spörl, *Grundformen*, pp. 21 ff.

[3] Chenu, *TDS*, p. 70.

Another suggestion for the origin of monastic concern for history lies close at hand in the life of the monastery and close to the heart of many a monk. R. W. Southern suggests that the rise of history-writing on the part of monastics was motivated by a desire to glorify the local community by recording its past and by the very practical community need to preserve the records of the monastery, thus securing monastic rights in feudal courts and enhancing the reputation of the community in the eyes of men.[3]

Both of these suggestions have merit and find support in the monastic life of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. They contribute to an understanding of the rise of historical writing in the Middle Ages. There is, however, another aspect of the life characteristic of monastic and canonical communities which provided not only an impetus for historical writing, but also furnished a framework within which history might be interpreted. This aspect of the cloistered life was daily participation in the liturgy.[4] For monastic writers the act of recording history, like the chanting of the liturgy, was a vital means of engaging in the praise of God for His mighty works.[1] "Ordericus Vitalis, . . . says several times that one must 'sing' history like a hymn in honor of Him who created the world and governs it with justice."[2] Hugh of St. Victor was in hearty agreement with this Benedictine historian at Saint-Evroult.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Spörl, *Grundformen*, pp. 32-50, and Petry, "Three Medieval Chroniclers," pp. 281-84 and notes. Cf. also, C. H. Mierow, trans., *The Two Cities: A Chronicle of Universal History to the Year 1146 AD, by Otto Bishop of Freising* (New York, 1928), introd., pp. 1-84. A. Hofmeister, "Studien über Otto von Freising," *Neues Archiv*, XXXVI (1912), 149 f., suggests that Otto may have been a student of Hugh's during his stay in Paris.

[2] On the place of eschatology, twelfth-century historiography, and the important role it played, cf. R. C. Petry, "Three medieval chroniclers," pp. 282 ff.

[3] Cf. *The Making of the Middle Ages*, p. 192. Leclercq, *LLDG*, p. 197 agrees that this is one factor among several.

[4] This has been shown by Leclercq, *LLDG*, pp. 159 f.

It is true that the liturgy enveloped the monk in a world rich in symbols which pointed to transcendent spiritual realities.[4] Suger's narrative of the dedication of the new church of the Abbey of St. Denis, during which he suddenly saw in the earthly celebration of the Eucharist the reflection of the celestial leiturgia is indicative of such a frame of mind.[5] The same may be said of the whole of Suger's building activities at St. Denis.[6]

The liturgy has another aspect, however. The structure of the yearly cycle of the liturgy was a continual recapitulation of the history of the people of God, Hebrews and Gentiles both, moving through the vicissitudes of this life toward their ultimate eschatological destiny.[1] The Lenten *agon* placed the recapitulation of the five ages of history from the Creation to the Incarnation before the brethren in dramatic form.[2] Lessons from the Bible accompanied by selections from the commentaries and writings of the great doctors of the Church underscored the significance of the history of the Hebrew people and elucidated the foreshadowing of the life and history of the Church in the history of the earlier people. Throughout the liturgical year the continuing history of the Church in the sixth age, the age of grace, was recounted by means of the celebration of the feast days of the saints.[3]

---

[1] On the liturgy as praise, cf. Berliere L'ascèse bénédictine, pp. 151 and 168.

[2] Ibid., p. 159. On Ordericus, cf. the study by H. Wolter, Ordericus Vitalis: ein Beitrag zur kluniazensischen Geschichtsschreibung (Wiesbaden, 1955). Also, Spörl, Grundformen, p. 60 with notes, and Petry, "Three Medieval Chroniclers," pp. 295 ff.

[3] It was the sense of eschatology and divine providence which enabled medieval men to write universal history. Cf. E. Gilson, The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy, trans. A.H.C. Downes (New York, 1936), pp. 385-92.

[4] Cf. Chenu, TDS, p. 347.

[5] Cf. Libellus alter de consecratione esslesiae sancti Dionysii, in Abbot Suger on the Abbey Church of St.-Denis and its Art Treasures, ed., trans., and annot. by E. Panofsky (Princeton, N. J., 1946), pp. 119-21.

[6] On Suger's building program at St. Denis and the Dionysian light metaphysic which informed his attitude, cf. Otto von Simson, The Gothic Cathedral. Origins of Gothic Architecture and the Medieval Concept of Order (2nd. ed., rev.; New York, 1962), chaps. III and IV, esp. pp. 102 ff.

Hearing the lives of the saints read in the context of the liturgy the individual was again plunged into the very history of God's people and impelled to reflect not only upon the *magnalia Dei* recorded in the Bible, but also on His active providence visible in the present age. Hagiography was over credulous and burdened with legendary material.[4] Nevertheless it possessed an essential historical core and performed a crucial historical function within the structure of the liturgy.

In the *Didascalicon*, Hugh quite clearly connected the study of the Bible *ad historiam* with the liturgical praise of God. "You have in history the means through which to admire God's deeds. . . ."[1] Perusing the pages of holy writ, the reader will see the way in which God has guided His people, how he sent His Son to restore mankind, and what the fruition of history will be in the Last Judgment. "See how, from the time when the world began until the end of the ages, the mercies of God do not slacken."[2]

---

[1] For the evolution of the structure of the liturgical cycle, cf. Pierre Batiffol, *History of the Roman Breviary*, trans. A.M.Y. Baylay (3rd. ed.; London, 1912).

[2] Cf. O. B. Hardison, *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages* (Baltimore, Md., 1965), pp. 80 ff.

[3] The offices of the saints were originally celebrated in the cemetaries, but after ca. 750 the celebrations were incorporated into the daily office of the churches in the city. Cf. Batiffol, *History*, pp. 99 ff. for these offices.

[4] Cf. the judicious remarks of Leclercq, *LLDG*, pp. 164-69.

In the third and fourth books of *De vanitate mundi* the connection between the writing of history and a liturgical frame of reference was even more pronounced.[3] Recounting the *processus saeculi* through the various stages of Biblical history, culminating in the Incarnation of the Word and the sending forth of the twelve apostles, the narrator (*ratio*) repeatedly moved his partner in the dialogue (*anima*) to the praise of what God has done in history.

> A. Greatly do I admire, and I am amazed (*Valde admiror, et stupeo*) within myself when I take notice to consider the divine disposition of passing things . . . .[4]
>
> A. How very great and amazing (*stupenda*) are the works of God in the universe, . . .[5]

Such outbursts of praise for the mighty works of God in nurturing and delivering His people through ~~all~~ of the trying times of their history suggest a meditative reading of Scripture in an atmosphere of praise.[1] Such was the context of liturgical regularity.

---

[1] *Did.*, VI, 3; Butt., p. 116, Tay., p. 138.

[2] *Ibid.*, Butt., p. 117, Tay., p. 139.

[3] Cf. MPL 176:721 ff. According to the *Indiculum* II, 34, the work concludes at col. 739B with the words ". . . totis desideriis colliguntur." Cf. de Ghellinck, "La table," pp. 281 and 391. The rest of the text printed in the Migne edition is condensed from Hugh's *In Eccl.*, XIII, MPL 175:204D-206D. According to Lasic, *Théologia perfectiva*, p. 28, the last two books of *DVM* frequently appear in MSS. with the title *De laude patrum*.

[4] *DVM*, III, MPL 176:724D-725A.

[5] *Ibid.*, 726B.

At the end of the twelfth century we find Baldwin of Ford describing his attitude in the presence of the Eucharist by the words which echo those of Hugh: stupor et admiratio. Dom Leclercq comments on Baldwin's attitude?

> He never grows accustomed to the sublime realities on which his glance lingers; his wonder never diminishes; he marvels at the mystery Revelation proposes for contemplation, . . . His admiration rewards and, at the same time, stimulates his faith, and these two dispositions of the soul augment each other mutually. They awaken the intelligence and all the other faculties of man: reflection and understanding are benefited by admiration and, in turn foster charity and all the other virtues, and mystical experience and asceticism flow from them.[2]

What Baldwin experienced in the presence of the Sacrament par excellance was the same experience Hugh felt in the presence of history. History was, for our Victorine canon, equally sacramental. God has revealed Himself in the Incarnation of the Word and in His sacraments, which preceeded and followed Him from the Creation of the world to the Consummation of the same.

The place of hagiography in the liturgy and the role it played in sensitizing participants in the liturgy to the continuing outpouring of God's grace have been noted. Dom Leclercq has pointed out the great enthusiasm which monastics showed in writings on the lives of saints and in composing the liturgical offices for their feast days.[3] In De vanitate mundi we find

---

[1] Cf. De meditatione, II, 3, trans. Baron, Textes spirituelles, p. 12 f.: "In meditating on the reading of Scripture, . . . from the point of view of the historical sense, we seek the reason for events and we admire their perfect congruence with respect to times, places, and circumstances. The consideration of divine judgments exercises the person meditating; no period has lacked right and just men, by whom the things needful were accomplished and that which was just was declared." Latin text ed. Baron, "Rapports," pp. 406 ff.

[2] Cf. LLDG, p. 228.

[3] Ibid., pp. 235-38.

Hugh using this literary form with its peculiarly liturgical background and stimulation to provide the narrative for an exposition of the early history of the Church in the age of grace.[1]

The procession of the martyrs began with Stephen. Peter, "having founded the throne of the true Rome ascended triumphant by the cross."[2] He was succeeded in the cathedra of Rome by Clement. Next, Hugh revealed the Parisian cast of this martyrology with the introduction of "dionysius Areopagita," martyr.[3] A venerable tradition had conflated the persons of Dionysius the Areopagite known to Paul, Dionysius the first missionary bishop to Gaul, and Dionysius a martyr at Paris.[4] This conflate personality was furthermore identified as the author of the corpus of Dionysian writings so influential in the medieval period.[5] It is not surprising that this Dionysius--second generation witness of the faith, bishop, martyr, theologian, and mystic--should find his place in the unfolding history of God's people in the New Age.

The account of martyrs continues after Dionysius with notices of varying length. Laurentius leads the list, followed by Vincent, Agatha,

---

[1] Books III and IV, MPL 176:721-739.

[2] Ibid., IV, 736D-737A.

[3] Ibid., 737A.

[4] Cf. the clear manifestation of this conflation in the Sequence by Adam of St. Victor for the feast day of St. Dionysius in Wrangham, Liturgical Poetry, III, 28 ff. On the origin of the legends associated with Dionysius, cf. S. McK. Crosby, The Abbey of St.-Denis (New Haven, 1942), pp. 24 ff.

[5] On the relationship of Hugh and the pseudo-Dionysian corpus, cf. supra, pp. 30 f.

Agnes, Margarita, Cecilia, Lucia, Vitus, Cyricus, and Gloriosa Thebaeorum.[1] Next-to-last comes the patron saint of the Abbey, Victor, with a lengthy account of his martyrdom. The list concludes with Pope Sylvester.

Hugh then turned from the martyrs to saints of another kind: The desert fathers, the catholic doctors, and the monastic founders.[2] In the lives and writings of these men the spread of the Church "to the limits of the orb of the earth"[3] can be observed. A new army of militants has spread over the earth to carry on the war Christ and his faithful followers wage with the devil.[4] The desert no longer is a place of desolation. It is a garden blossoming with the flowers of the fragrant virtues of the saints.[5] Paul, Anthony, and Hilary are "precious stones" in the desert, while Macharius, Pannucius, Arsenius, and Pastor, all near to Moses in spirit and virtue, lead the multitude of the people of God through the desert of this world to the promised land.[1]

---

[1] No attempt has been made here to identify these figures, nor to relate them to the liturgy at St. Victor. Sequences for the feast days of several of them were written by Adam of St. Victor; cf. Wrangham, _Liturgical Poetry_, _s.v._

[2] Uses of this paradigm for the progression of history in the age of grace "multiply in the essays on the theology of history in the twelfth century." Cf. de Lubac, _EM_, I, ii, 574 f. Hugh, unlike others, does not associate the last age, that of the monks, with the coming of the Antichrist, but he does indicate that with it the _processus saeculi_ comes to a close.

[3] _DVM_, IV, MPL 176:738C.

[4] _Ibid._, 735C.

[5] _Ibid._, 738CD; cf. 735C.

The great doctors of the Church, Ephraem, Basil, Gregory, Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine, along with "many others throughout the whole orb of the earth," form the columns of the house of God, the Church, "erected and sculpted in decorous and gracious form."[2] Gregory the Great, "full of the spirit of another," has adorned the structure with various colors, through the beauty and joy of virtue.[3] Finally the praises of Martin, Nicholas, and Benedict were sounded, and with that the account of the _processus saeculi_ was brought to a close.[4]

Life in the Victorine abbey would support a liturgical view of history which praised the history of God's people in the Biblical record and in the lives of the martyrs, desert fathers, doctors, and monastic founders. As we have seen, the Victorine pattern of life was centered upon regularized communal participation in the liturgy. Such a mode of life was characteristic of the monastic renewal of the twelfth century and of some, but not all, of the newly founded houses of canons regular.[1]

---

[1] In monastic literature the Exodus was seen as a "type" of the monastic profession. Cf. de Lubac, _EM_, I, ii, 576 f., and our discussion of the theme, _infra_, pp. 169 f. The same journey was also a "type" of the contemplative ascent, and in particular the ascent of Mt. Sinai by Moses was placed in this context; cf. _A. myst._, VII, MPL 176:695AB, and _infra_, pp. 347 ff.

[2] _DVM_, IV, MPL 176:739A. Hugh drew here on the traditional interpretation of the Temple of Solomon, in which the columns supporting the Temple were interpreted as the doctors who support the Church.

[3] Cf. _Did._, V, 7, Butt., p. 105, Tay., p. 128, where Gregory is praised in connection with reading Scripture "for the correction of morals."

[4] _DVM_, IV, MPL 176:739A.

Unfortunately the Victorine liturgy and the literary documents associated with it are yet unstudied to a great extent. Bonnard examined liturgical texts in connection with his manuscript investigations for the history of the Abbey. He announced an intention to study the liturgical life of the canons more fully, but he never carried out his intent.[2]

The liturgy was also the context for nurturing the vocation of contemplation.[3] Of the three biblical senses, tropology was especially related to the contemplative life.[4] Allegory contributed to the overall context in which the contemplative life was set. Insofar as contemplation is Christocentric and set within the community of faith, as was the mystical life at St. Victor, allegory will provide significant support, for allegory is primarily concerned with "Christ and His Church." Tropology, de Lubac has reminded us is 'built' upon allegory.[5]

---

[1] Dickinson, Austin Canons, chap. II, esp. pp. 72-79.

[2] Histoire, p. 83. Chap. IV of Bonnard's study contains the description of a typical day at St. Victor and includes a brief summary of the liturgical aspects. Ibid., p. xxix, lists some of the more important liturgical MSS. from St. Victor now in the Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris.

[3] Cf. Leclercq, LLDG, pp. 232-49, "The Poem of the Liturgy," and pp. 250-65, "Literature and the Mystical Life."

[4] Cf. de Lubac, EM, I, ii, chap. IX, "La tropologie mystique." It should be noted that the anagogical sense, excluded from Hugh's triad of senses, underwent something of a transformation in the medieval period. The primary orientation toward eschatology was partially displaced by the Dionysian understanding of anagogy as a spiritual purification and interior ascension toward pure contemplation, transcending all symbols and temporal realities. "In the tradition influenced by Denys, a dissociation tended to occur between invisibilia and futura, . . ." Ibid., I, ii, 641.

[5] "One passes from history to tropology by means of allegory. Allegory consists totally in the mystery of Christ, and it is this mystery which, in tropologie, is found interiorized." Ibid., p. 588.

The two grand masters of the tropological sense were Origen and Gregory the Great.[1] Gregory was omnipresent, as it were, in the Middle Ages, and formed a staple item in the medieval diet whether read in private or in liturgical lections.[2] The presence of Origen was not so obvious. Now, de Lubac and Leclercq have shown that whether by anonymous transmission or deliberate use, Origen's homilies and commentaries were widely used in monastic circles in the middle ages.[3] Origen the theologian might be suspect. Origen the commentator and preacher was accepted. This was true at St. Victor. The Liber Ordinis of the Victorine house, probably written under the abbacy of the learned and respected Guilduin,[4] shows that Origen's commentaries formed a substantial part of the cycle of patristic commentaries on scripture designated to be read in Ecclesia.[5] Augustine and Gregory were also specified. During the meal readings were also liturgically and tropologically oriented. The lives of the saints were read in harmony with the cycle of the liturgical year and feasts. The meal itself was set within the context of liturgical observance, the canons chanting in procession as they moved from the refectory to the choir.[6] Baron indicates that John Cassian was read at meals in the abbey.[1] If so, again we find a master of the spiritual life addressing the canons via the voice of the daily reader during the common meal. Reading Cassian put the canons in the world of those spiritual athletes, the fathers of the desert, and provided them with a comprehensive manual for the ascetic and contemplative life.

---

[1] EM, I, ii, 588.

[2] On Gregory's mystical theology and his influence, cf. Leclercq, LLDG, chap. II. Also, cf. de Lubac, EM, I, ii, 537 ff. on medieval veneration of Gregory.

[3] Cf. Ibid., pp. 221-38. Cf. the good summary of the influence, especially in the context of monastic revival, in Leclercq, LLDG, pp. 100 ff. and refs. in n. 26.

[4] Cf. Bonnard, Histoire, p. 48. Dickinson, Austin Canons, p. 85, agrees with Bonnard.

[5] Cf. Edmundo Martene, De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus (4 vols.; Bassendi, 1788), III, 780-82. For example, Origen was read with Isaiah, the Pentateuch, and Kings; Augustine, with the Psalms; Gregory, with Job.

[6] Cf. Bonnard, Histoire, pp. 76 ff.

This schooling in the contemplative life via literature and the liturgy was enhanced by the preaching of the canons, the program of collations and studies promoted by Hugh, and the literary and musical activity of such men as Adam of St. Victor. The two treatises on Noah's Ark grew out of one of the collations held by Hugh. In them, we find the canon regular employing all the resources of history, allegory, and tropology to commend the life of ascending virtue which culminates in the contemplative experience. The development of the theme was somewhat leisurely. One senses the "deep and reflective reading" of Scripture which characterized the Victorine program of studies. Hugh carefully laid his historical foundations. He developed allegory sensitively and with a hand for creative innovation. Finally, he invited the canons to a meditative journey through the symbolic Ark of Noah where they might find, to delight their minds and to inspire them to virtuous living,

---

[1] Baron, Sci. et Sg., pp. 170 f.

> all the works of restoration . . . from the world's beginning to its end; and therein is represented the condition of the universal Church. Into it is woven the story of events (historia), in it are found the mysteries of the sacraments (allegoria), and there are set out the stages of affections, thoughts, meditations, contemplations, good works, virtues, and rewards (tropologia).[1]

To Hugh's treatises on the Ark and to his meditative reading of history and Scripture we now turn.

---

[1] A. morl., IV, 21, MPL 176:680AB, Sq., p. 152; cf. DVM, II, 5, MPL 176:719D-720, Sq., pp. 181 f. Cf. Hugh's comments concerning meditation on Scripture according to history, allegory, and tropology. De meditatione, II, 3, trans. Baron, Textes spirituelles, pp. 12 f. Latin text, ed. Baron, "Rapports," pp. 406 ff.

CHAPTER II

The Ark of Noah

Consideration of the Ark treatises must begin with elucidation of the content of the drawing which Hugh placed before his auditors in the cloister of St. Victor as he expounded on the Ark of Noah for the first time. De arca Noe morali makes a number of references to a drawing while De arca Noe mystica is a description of the way in which the same drawing was made.[1] Despite the importance of this drawing within the context of the Ark treatises its significance has been appreciated only in part.[2] Furthermore, previous studies concerned with the treatises on the Ark have explored insufficiently the iconography of the drawing of the Ark.[3] There have been serious misinterpretations of factual material and of Hugh's intentions with respect to the literal interpretation of the structure of the Ark.[1]

---

[1] Cf., e.g., A. morl., I, 10, MPL 176:625B, sq., p. 57: "Other Things also...must be taken in conjunction not with the prophecy but with the picture." Also, ibid., II, 11, MPL 176:642D, Sq., p. 87: "This is the reason why...we have represented the aforesaid pillar in the middle of the Ark, and have inscribed 'The Tree of Life' upon the south side, and 'The Book of Life' upon the north." On the pillar and the trees, cf. A. myst., II and VIII, MPL 176:684AB and 696B.

[2] Schneider, Geschichte, p. 36 approached a true appreciation of the drawing and its implications but only in a brief comment.

[3] Squire, SSW, p. 32, has misunderstood the crucial relationship between the Ark and the figure of Christ. cf. infra. Smalley, SBMA, Ch. III, and de Lubac, EM, II, i, Ch. IV, are interested almost exclusively in the literal interpretation of the structure of the Ark.

It is necessary to begin with a reconstruction of the drawing. As Miss Smalley has pointed out, visual images were primary in the twelfth century.

> The roles of text and picture, that we are accustomed to, seem to be reversed in much of the twelfth-century educational literature. You begin with your picture, to which the text is a commentary and illustration. The most abstract teaching must take its starting point from some concrete shape which the pupil can have visibly depicted for him. Hugh makes use of this method in his two treatises on Noe's ark . . . . He proceeds in a pictorial way.[2]

Thus we follow Hugh's own way by seeking to visualize the drawing which he tells us that he set before the brethren.[3]

The drawing contained two chief elements, an elaborate and intricate drawing of the Ark of Noah and a sketch of Jesus Christ. Included also was a device Hugh called a *machina universitatis*.[4]

Christ was represented according to the description of the Lord given by Isaiah in recounting his Temple vision. (Is. 6)

> And I want to represent this Person to you in such wise as Isaiah testifies that he beheld Him. So I shall quote Isaiah's words to you, and from them take the thing I want to show you; so that what the literal sense says the prophecy may confirm.[5]

---

[1] *Ibid.*

[2] *SBMA*, 95.

[3] Cf. *A. morl.*, I, 7, MPL 176:622C, Sq., p. 52.

[4] *Ibid.*, "Now the figure...I am going to present to you is Noe's Ark . . . . and also I have Christ's whole Person...in a form you can see." On the *machina*, cf. *A. myst.*, XV, MPL 176:700D ff.

[5] *A. morl.*, I, 7, MPL 176:622C, Sq., p. 52.

Hugh depicted Christ sitting enthroned, with His arms outstretched and a seraph on either side. The six-winged seraphs veiled their own bodies with one pair of wings and veiled the head (not the face) and the feet of the Lord with the remaining two pairs of wings each. Hugh departed from the text of Isaiah, which said the seraphs covered the face, for he wanted to indicate that while for men in this life the *visio Dei* is impossible, the angels see God "face to face".[1]

On either side of the body of Christ angels were arranged in an hierarchical, pyramidal order, with their faces turned upward toward the face of divinity in contemplative wonder. Christ enthroned in majesty was thus depicted as the Object of contemplative joy.[2]

At the feet of the figure of the Lord a vivid representation of the scene of the Day of Judgment was situated. The Lord was thus conceived as the Object of the contemplative *visio* of the angels and saints in heaven and as the terrible merciful Judge who will adjudicate the fate of humanity at the Last Day toward which the cosmos is moving. Like the scenes of the Day of Judgment in the *tympani* of numerous church and cathedral portals in the middle ages, this drawing depicted the blessed and the damned at the moment of judgment and separation.[1] The blessed elect were being received into heaven by the angels; meanwhile the damned were being seized violently by the demons and were being carried away to the tortures of hell.[2]

---

[1] On this, cf. ibid., ch. 8, 622Dff., Sq., p. 52ff. Hugh has another treatment of this same question of the visio in ibid., ch. 15, 631D-633A, Sq., pp. 67ff. Cf. also, DS, III, xviii, 16, MPL 176:613A-614B, "On the vision of God". The chapter is essentially an excerpt from Augustine; cf. H. Weisweiller, "Die Arbeitsmethode . . . .," *Schol.*, XXIV (1949), 254-56.

[2] Cf. *A. myst.*, XV, MPL 176:702CD. The angels were placed on either side of Christ's body and were arranged in the traditional nine orders. The first order had two angels on either side of the majesty, the second had three, the third four, etc., giving a total of 108 angels. For Hugh on angels, cf. DS, I, v, 33ff., MPL 176:262ff. Cf. Mignon, I, 365ff. For a detailed treatment of angelology, cf. art. "Ange," *DTC*, I, i, cols. 1189-1271.

The arms of the Christ figure are extended outward "as if to encompass all things". As we shall see, Christ's arms embrace the *machina universitatis*, but our attention now turns to the objects which Christ holds in each hand. In His right hand, the Lord holds a throne. In His left hand there is a scepter. The throne and scepter extend from Christ's hands to the scene of judgment at His feet. The throne is associated with the reception of the blessed elect. The scepter terminates in the terrifying portrayal of the damnation of the wicked.[3]

Each of these objects bears an inscription drawn from the description of the moment of eschatological judgment in the twenty-fifth chapter of the Gospel according to Matthew. Upon the throne we find the words: "Come, O blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." (Matt. 25:34. RSV.) The scepter bore the inscription:

---

[1] For the development of the iconography of the scene of the Last Judgment in medieval art, with particular attention to the *tympani* of churches, cf. E. Mâle, *L'Art religieux du xii*^{e} *siècle en France*. *Étude sur les origines de l'iconographie du moyen âge* (3me. ed, rev. et corr.; Paris, 1928), pp. 176-82, 406-19. Cited hereafter as Mâle, *L'Art rel. du xii*^{e} *s*. Also, *The Gothic Image*. *Religious Art in France of the Thirteenth Century*, trans. Dora Nussey (New York, 1958), pp. 365-383. Cited hereafter as Mâle, *The Gothic Image*. Joseph Sauer, *Symbolik des Kirchengebäudes and seiner Ausstattung in der Auffassung des Mittelalters* (Zweite Aufl.; Münster, 1964), pp. 319ff. Cited hereafter as Sauer, *Symbolik*. Karl Künstle, *Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst* (2 vols.; Freiburg im Breisgau, 1928), I, 521-557. Citer hereafter as Künstle, *Ikonographie*. For medieval eschatology generally, cf. R. C. Petry, *Christian Eschatology and Social Thought* (New York, 1956), Chs. 4-6, esp.

[2] *A. myst.*, XV, MPL 176:702AB. [3] *ibid.*

"Depart from me, you cursed, into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels." (Matt. 25:41. RSV.) Similar inscriptions were placed on scrolls to the right and left of the figure of Christ in the Judgment scene above the portal of the church of the Abbey of St. Denis at Paris.[1]

The association ~~of the~~ throne with the elect is explained in the allegorical interpretation of Isaiah's vision in *De arca Noe morali.* Isaiah described the throne of the Lord as "high and lifted up". (Is. 6:1) Interpreted allegorically, "high" refers to the "angelic spirits"gathered round the Lord in eternal worship and service. The throne "lifted up" represented the "saints, who from this world's abyss have been translated to the joys of peace on high . . . ."[2] Therefore, in the symbolic world of Hugh of St. Victor, the throne is rightly to be associated with the elect being welcomed by the angelic hosts.

The scepter clearly represents the sovereign power of the Lord in His office as Judge of humanity. The reader is reminded by this iconographic usage that He hesitates not in the exercise of His terrible but just power to condemn the wicked to the eternal fire.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Mâle, *L'art rel. du xii^{e} s.*, p. 177, fig. 136. The verses are shortened to "Benite benedicte patris" and "Discedite a me maledicti."

[2] *A. morl.*, I, 8, 622D; Sq., pp. 52f.

[3] On the Last Judgment, cf. DS, II, xvii and xviii, MPL 176:597-618 Def. pp. 451-76. These parts are composed mainly of patristic extracts with some chapters from Hugh's pen. Apparently Hugh did not complete work on the final parts of *De sacramentis*. Cf. H. Weisweiller, "Die Arbeitsmethode . . . ." *Schol.*, XXIV (1949), 254-56; and L. Ott, "Hugo von St. Viktor . . . ." *Divus Thomas* (Freiburg), XXVII (1949), 307-310. On the Judgment, cf. also *DS*, I, viii, 5, MPL 176:309C-310B, Def. p. 145.

Thus far in the iconograph we find Christ depicted in eschatological categories, namely those of the Object of angelic contemplation and the Judge of mankind on the Last Day. Both of these envision "Christ the end". Christ, however, is both alpha and omega, beginning and end, as Hugh reminded his readers in the opening lines of De arca Noe mystica.[1] In the iconograph the "alpha" function of Christ was integrated into the complex interplay of relationships which the symbolism subtly and firmly suggested. Christ the contemplative Object and the Judge is also Christ the Creative Word, or Wisdom, of God. Beginning and End were envisioned Christologically within the structure of the single iconograph.

To depict Christ in His function as the Creative Word of God Hugh employed a rather bizarre but clearly effective iconographic device. From the mouth of the Lord Hugh drew a vertical chain of six discs hanging downward and terminating at the bow of the Ark. Each of these six discs represented one of the six days of creation. The whole chain represented, consequently, the work of creation, the opus conditionis.[2]

> Six rotulae are drawn in order . . . . These six rotulae portray [exprimunt] the works of the six days. The text which follows contains a description of the work accomplished on each of the six days of creation. As the Word procedes from the mouth of the Majesty, the whole order of creatures follows . . . .[3]

---

[1] I, 681B.

[2] The opening page of Hugh's Chronica also recounted the six days of creation. Cf. W. M. Green, "Hugo of St. Victor . . . .," Speculum, XVIII (1943), pl. facing p. 492. Six crescents were arranged, three on either side of the vertical list of the works of the six days, to indicate the distinction between the three days of arrangement (dispositio) and the three of adornment (ornatus). Cf. DS, I, i, 24 and 25, MPL 176:202D-203A, Def. 25. The distinction between the two groups of three days entered the western tradition from the eastern fathers via Bede. Cf. C. Spicq, Esquisse, pp. 30 f.

[3] A. myst. XV, 702BC

Such a clear presentation of the distinct works of God accomplished on each 'day' of creation served to underscore visually the hugonian contention that the creation was an event which took place in time. He vigorously opposed the Augustinian position that the biblical narrative of the six days was an allegory in its entirety and that creation was accomplished in a single instant, God having produced and formed everything simultaneously.[1] For Augustine the text of Ecclesiasticus 18:1 offered the key for understanding the creation of the universe: "He that liveth for ever created all things together".[2]

---

[1] Hugh's position is in DS I, i, 2-8, MPL 176:187C-193D, Def., pp. 8-14. On Augustine's position, cf. E. Gilson, St. Augustine, pp. 189-209 and notes; and History, pp. 72-74 and 592, n. 22. For a survey of the exegetical tradition with respect to the interpretation of the hexameron in the East and the West, cf. Mignon, vol. I, ch. 8. Mignon cites the Cappadocians as interpreting the six days literally and admitting a succession in the divine works. Thus they stand opposed to Augustine's viewpoint. The Cappadocians influenced Ambrose, Gregory the Great, and particularly Bede, who influenced Hugh. Note that the Glossa ordinaria cited Bede for the literal sense and Augustine and Isidore for allegory only. Cf. ibid., 316. For a resolution of the question in favor of Augustine, cf. the Sententiae divinae paginae and the Sententiae Anselmi, ed. Bliemetzrieder, "Anselms von Laon Systematisches Sentenzen," BGPTMA, XVIII, 2/3 (Münster, 1919), pp. 12 and 49. Taylor has pointed out, Did., p. 227, n. 3, that Hugh's view of creation was equally opposed to that of the platonists of Chartres, esp. William of Conches. Cf. also Chenu, Theologie, p. 121.

[2] De Gen ad litt. lib. imp. VII, 28, MPL 34:231. Cited by Gilson, St. Augustine, p. 340, n. 5.

As was his custom in dealing with disputed points, Hugh took account of Augustine's position and presented it fairly and anonymously before offering his own view.[1] The "second Augustine" departed from the interpretation offered by his erstwhile mentor and presented the narrative of creation as a description of events in time which were capable of allegorical and tropological interpretation.[2]

The iconographical device of a vertical chain of six discs used to represent the six days of creation is found elsewhere in medieval iconography in illuminated biblical letters. In some manuscripts a chain of six discs or medallions can be found in the large illuminated letter 'I' with which the book of Genesis begins: "In principio . . . ." (Gen. 1:1.)[3] Each medallion contained a small picture indicating the phase of creation completed on that particular day, clearly paralleling Hugh's description of the use of the discs in De arca Noe mystica. The illuminated 'I' of the biblical manuscripts did not, however, relate the chain to a figure of Christ in the manner in which Hugh carried out this aspect of the symbolism.

---

[1] DS, I, i, 2, MPL 176:187C-188B, Def., p. 8.

[2] For examples of mystical interpretations of the works of creation, cf. DS, I, i, 12, "The sacrament of the divine works." and DS, I, i, 10, "The sacrament of the matters mentioned above." MPL 176:195C-197B, 200C-201A, Def., pp. 16-18, 22. Also, De tribus diebus, XXVII, MPL 176:837C-838D.

[3] Cf. Camille Gaspar at Frederic Lyna, Les principaux manuscrits de la Bibliotheque royale de Belgique (Paris, 1937), pls. 35-38. Cf. also Otto Pächt and J. J. G. Alexander, Illuminated Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library Oxford. I: German, Dutch, Flemish, French and Spanish Schools. (Oxford, 1966), figs., 525 and 548, pls. XL and XLI. All the illuminations cited are thirteenth century. Reau, Iconographie, p. 66, notes that in the early middle ages the Genesis cycle usually began with the creation of man or the expulsion from the garden. Cf. A. Boeckler, Die Regensburg-Prüfeninger Buchmalerei des XII. and XIII. Jahrhunderts ("Miniaturen aus Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek in München," VIII; München, 1924), p. 31: "Vor dem 12. Jahrhundert kenne ich solche Zyklen der Schöpfungstage nicht; auch vor 1200 sind sie seiten." However, the Ashburnham Pentateuch contained separate illuminations depicting the days of creation. Cf. DACL, I, i, 2972.

The use of the device of the six discs demonstrates Hugh's capacity to take a very simple iconographical device and make it the vehicle for rather subtle theological meaning. For Hugh the created order was the external, visible manifestation of the eternal, invisible Wisdom of God. The created world, through its beauty and order "speaks" as it were to man concerning the Creator. Without glossing over the difference between the eternal and the temporal, Hugh likened the world as an expression of God's eternal Wisdom to the audible word of man which expresses his inward, "inaudible" thoughts.[1]

---

[1] Cf. DS, I, iii, 20, MPL 176:225AB, Def., p. 50; A. morl. II, 12 and 13, MPL 176:643B-646A, Sq., pp. 87-92; De tribus diebus, I-IV, MPL 176:811C-816B, esp. 914B-815A.

Furthermore, with the medieval tradition in general Hugh understood the Word, the second Person of the Trinity, to be the agent of Creation.[1] As a result, the way in which the discs representing the work of creation proceed from the mouth of the majesty is of more than incidental interest. Creation, Redemption, and Consummation were subtly related in the powerful and provocative iconography of the drawing which accompanied the treatises on the Ark of Noah.

We now come to the relationship of the figure of the Lord enthroned in glory to one of the other major elements of the drawing. In the drawing only the head, arms, and feet of the Lord were visible. The remainder of the figure was covered by a construct which Hugh termed a "machina universitatis."[2] In the center of the machina the Ark of Noah was set, so that the vessel might coincide with the body of Christ--for both were symbols of the Church.

This machina universitatis was a "symbolic cosmos," a type of symbol not unusual in the twelfth century.[3] Hugh, however, exhibited his own predilections in developing the structure of this machina, as we shall see.

---

1. Cf. A. morl., II, 13, MPL 176:644D, Sq. p., 90, where Hugh speaks of "the wisdom of God through which God made all of his works." Also, "The Word, therefore, speaks the word. But the word that is made is spoken by the Word that makes, the word that passes by the Word not subject to change . . . ." Ibid., 645C.

2. A. myst., XV, MPL 176:702A

3. Cf. the very important article by M.-Th. d'Alverny, "Le cosmos symbolique du xii^{e} siècle," AHDLMA, XX (1953), 31-81, with exhaustive citation of the literature in footnotes. Cf. also Künstle, Ikonographie, pp. 138ff.; Hans Liebeschutz, Das Allegorische Weltbild der Heiligen Hildegard von Bingen ("Studien der Bibliothek Warburg,"XVI; Leipzig-Berlin, 1930); M.-M. Davy, Initiation a la Symbolique Romane (XII^{e} siècle) (Nouv. ed.; Paris, 1964), esp. pp. 150-177, cited hereafter as Davy, Initiation; and Louis Reau, Iconographie de l'Art chretien (6 vols.; Paris, 1955), I, 69-72, 142-153, cited hereafter as Reau, Iconographie.

The machina was composed of a set of two concentric rings centered upon a map of the world (mappa mundi) which surrounded the Ark of Noah.[1] The outer ring represented the aether, or the heavens, while the inner ring represented the aer, or atmosphere, surrounding the earth.[2]

In the aether, i.e. in the supermundane region, Hugh placed the signs of the zodiac and the personifications of the twelve months.[3] The months and the zodical signs were so correlated that "a [zodiacal] sign always begins at the midpoint of a month, and on the other hand, a month begins at the midpoint of a sign."[4]

---

[1] A. myst., XIV-XV, MPL 176:700C-702A.

[2] The mathematical aspects of cosmology Hugh placed in the quadrivium. One part of geometry "cosmimetry" which "measures things spherical . . . ." while astronomy "considers . . . the mobile - the courses of the stars and the intervals of time and seasons." Cf. Did. II, 6, 9f., 13f., Butt., pp. 29ff., Tay., pp. 67f., 70; and Practica geometriae, ed. Baron in Opera propaedeutica, pp 1-22, 49-64. On the relationship of Did. and Prac. geom. cf. van den Eynde, Essai, pp. 47-49, who considers the Did. the earliest of Hugh's treatises on the "arts". Baron disagrees, placing the Did. late in the series of "arts" treatises, cf. Sci. et Sg., pp. xlv-l ;"Note sur la succession ...," RHE, LVII (1962), 88ff.; Études, passim; and Opera propaedeutica, pp. xi-xvii.

[3] On the personification of the months and the relationship of this to zodiacal signs in the art of the middle ages, cf. James Carson Webster, The Labors of the Months in Antique and Mediaeval Art ("Northwestern University Studies in the Humanities," n. 4; Evanston, Ill., 1938). Cited hereafter as Webster, Labors. For the French cycles of the twelfth century, cf. pp. 66-79; for German cycles, cf. pp. 86-88. Cf. also Reau, Iconographie, I, 144-53, and Künstle, Ikonographie, I, 151ff.

[4] A. myst., XV, MPL 176:701D.

The aer contained symbolic representations of two additional sets of cosmic phenomena, the winds and the four seasons.[1] The twelve winds were distributed equally about the circumference of the ring.[2] The figures intended to personify the four seasons were placed in their appropriate quarters, correlated with the months and the signs of the zodiac in the outer ring of the aether.[3] The figures representing the seasons were arranged around the circle so that spring was in the east according to the mappa mundi while summer was in the south, autumn in the west, and winter in the north.

The personifications of the seasons combined two themes which occurred with some frequency in medieval literature and art: 1) the parallel between the ages of man and the course of the year, the periods of history, or the canonical hours;[4] and 2) the personification of the months and seasons by way of illustrating activities appropriate to each period.[5] Hugh represented the seasons by four drawings, beginning with a youth for spring and ending with the figure of an old man in winter. Each drawing showed the person engaged in an action which gave some indication of the season. Hugh described them in this manner:

---

[1] A. myst., MPL 176:700D-701D.

[2] For an example of the twelve winds distributed around the outer circumference of a calendar representing the months and the signs of the zodiac, cf. Webster, Labors, fig. 88 and p. 169f. In addition to personified months, the calendar page has personified seasons.

[3] A. myst., MPL 176:700D.

[4] On the ages of man, cf. Kunstle, Ikonographie, I, 203, Hugh compared the six ages of history and the six ages of man in De scripturis, XVII, MPL 176:24C: "The six ages are expressed in a similitude of the ages of man. For the world has been an infant and a youth, etc." A similar parallel is found in Augustine, De vera rel., XXVII, 50 (94); and Div. quaest., q. 58, n. 2. Honorius of Autun paralleled the liturgical hours, the ages of man, and the progression in holy orders; cf. Gemma animae, II, 54, MPL 172:633; cited by Pourrat, Spiritualité, II, 173.

[5] Cf. Webster, Labors, passim.

> Spring is depicted from the loins upward as a youth holding a pipe in his hand and singing; Summer is a young man looking at flowers; autumn, an adult bringing up a prominent fruit to his nose and smelling; winter, in the form of an old man wasting away, eats fruit.[1]

The whole interweaving of seasons, zodiacal signs, cardinal points of the compass, months, and twelve winds reflected the conviction of medieval and ancient authors that the whole cosmos and the processes of nature represent a coordinated, cohesive, and harmonious entity.[2] To indicate more clearly the harmony of the cosmos, Hugh of St. Victor inscribed eight "cords" upon his drawing of the cosmos, arranging them so that two cords extended into each quadrant, or season. The number eight of the cords recalled the "ad invicem collatis musicum octochordium".[3] Thus, for Hugh, the harmony of the universe was a "musical" harmony, a theme often repeated in patristic and medieval thought.[4]

---

1. A. myst., MPL 176:700D-701A.

2. Cf. Mâle, L'Art rel. du xii^{e} S., ~~pp. 316-18, and~~ Davy, Initiation, 36ff.

3. A. myst., MPL 176:701B.

4. Honorius of Autun spoke of the world being like a great zither (quasi magnam citharam), Lib. XII Quaest., II, MPL 172:1179; cited by Davy, Initiation, p. 37. On the harmonious or musical universe, cf. Mâle, L'Art rel. du xii^{e} S., pp. 316ff., citing Boethius, De musica, MPL 63:1171 where the latter speaks of mundana musica, i.e. the harmony of the celestial spheres, the seasons, and the elements. A decisive influence upon the medieval concept of the harmonious universe was registered by Augustine in De musica, MPL 32. Cf. Otto von Simson, The Gothic Cathedral ("Bollingen Series," XLVIII; New York, 1955), pp. 21-58. Cited hereafter as Simson, Gothic.

Hugh singled out the harmony of the seasons to epitomize the harmony of the universe.[1] To each season, two of the four basic humors of matter were given. Between any two successive seasons the pairs of characteristics represented continuity and opposition, for harmony implies, these two qualities of sameness and difference.[2] The characteristics of spring were wetness and hotness. Summer was characterized as hot and dry, yielding sameness and difference with respect to spring. Autumn continued the pattern; it was dry and cold. Finally, winter was cold and wet.[3] In the drawing of the machina universitatis the eight cords apparently carried inscriptions to point out this harmonious interplay of the four basic "humors" of the cosmos in the succession of the seasons.[4]

At the center of this symbolic, harmonic cosmos Hugh drew a map of the world (mappa mundi).[5] The map carried indications of the major cities and countries of the world. Some were mentioned in the text of *De arca Noe mystica*: e.g., Egypt, Jerusalem, and Babylon.[1] In general the map carried indications of "places, mountains, rivers, villages and cities . . . ."[2] This relates the *mappa* of the Ark drawing very much to the literary *mappa mundi* which R. Baron has identified in Hugh's *Chronicon.*[3] This text was a list of prominent geographical features of the world, drawn essentially from Isidore and ancient classical sources. The various areas of the earth were grouped according to the major divisions of Asia, Europe, and Africa. The mountains, rivers, islands, and cities of each major region were listed in tabular form. The inclusion of this literary "map" in the *Chronicon* indicates that these features were those which Hugh thought the beginning student of scripture ought to commit to memory.

---

[1] Cf. Did., II, 12, Butt., pp. 32f., Tay., 69, where Hugh following Boethius finds the music of the universe in the elements, the planets, and the seasons. He repeats Boethius' threefold classification of music as mundana, humana, and instrumentalia (cosmic, human, and instrumental.)

[2] Cf. the definition of music given in the Diffinitiones magistri Hugonis, MS Douai 360, fol. 118rb: "Aliter musica siue armonia est plurimum dissimilium in unum redactorum concordia." Ed. R. Baron, "Hugues de Saint-Victor lexicographe," Cultura Neolatina, XVI (1956), p. 127.

[3] A. myst., MPL 176:701B.

[4] For other examples of this harmony of the four humors and the four seasons, cf. d'Alverny, "Le cosmos . . . .," AHDLMA, XX (1953), 74ff. and the third plate following p. 46. Cf. also Charles Singer, "The Scientific Views and Visions of Saint Hildegard (1098-1180), "Studies in the History and Method of Science, ed. Charles Singer (Oxford, 1917), pl. XIV.

[5] Cf. A. myst., XIV, MPL 176:700C: "In this space a map of the world (mappa mundi) is drawn . . . ."

The *mappa mundi* fulfilled two major functions and also reflected two dominant victorine concerns, i.e. history and allegorical symbolism. Aside from the necessity for representing the earth in any "symbolic cosmos," the *mappa* in the Ark drawing was intended to show the geographical relationship of significant locations and cities, particularly with respect to Biblical history. Thus, there was special mention of Egypt, Babylon, Jerusalem, the river Jordan, and the desert.

---

[1] E.g., c. XIII, MPL 176:699D. Cf. *A. morl.*, IV, 18, MPL 176:678AB, *Sq.*, p. 148; and *DVM*, II, MPL 176:720BD, *Sq.*, p. 182.

[2] *A. myst.*, XV, MPL 176:702C

[3] Baron has edited the text of the *Mappa mundi* in "Hugues de Saint Victor . . . ,"*Cultura Neolatina*, XVI (1956), 137-145. *On the Chronicon* in general, cf. W.M. Green, "Hugo of St. Victor . . .," *Speculum*, XVIII (1943), 484-93. Haureau, *Les Oeuvres*, pp. 94F. noted the passages in *A. myst.* dealing with the *mappa*. Schneider, *Geschichte*, p. 16, identified the *mappa* as lib. iii of pars I of Richard of St. Victor's *Liber exceptionem*. This was due in part to a confusion about authorship. The section in the *Liber* parallels the *Mappa mundi* in the *Chronicon* and is dependent upon Hugh's work. Cf. the critical edition of the *Liber exceptionem* by Chatillon, introd., and pp. 122-28.

The perceptive reader had more in this map than a geographical guide to accompany a study of history. He could also observe the manner in which the center of world power consistently moved from the east toward the west.[1] This was a key idea in Hugh's thought. Divine providence has so arranged the events of world history that time and place are correlated in significant relationships. Time and history began in the east, in Paradise. As time passed, the locus of significant events moved to the west with the shift of political power. In Hugh's own day the locus of power was approaching the westward limit of the world and hence the world was approaching the final limit of time.

> Divine providence seems to have arranged that the things that were done in the beginning of time should be done in the east, as in the beginning of the world; and that then, as time moved on towards the end, the climax of events should reach to the west; a fact from which we may conclude that the end of the age is approaching, since the course of events has now reached the end of the world.[2]

Geography and eschatology coalesce.

By observing the significance of the locations of Egypt and Babylon to the south and north of Jerusalem, and by recalling the chain of events which connected these locations in the history of the Hebrew people from Exodus to Exile, the reader who is sensitive to allegory will find a mystical meaning set forth.[3] In the juxtaposition of time and place, Egypt and

---

[1] A. morl., IV, 18, MPL 176:678AB, Sq., p. 148; and DVM, II, MPL 176:720BD, Sq., p. 182. Cf. Schneider, Geschichte, esp. ch. VI, "Das geographische Gesetz der Geschichte." Also, cf. Baron, Sci. et Sg., pp. 128-32, 140-45.

[2] A. morl., IV, 18, MPL 176:677D, Sq., p. 147. Note also, A. myst., XIV and XV, MPL 176:700CD and 702C. This progression from east to west influenced Otto of Freising. Cf. Schneider, Geschichte, p. 93.

[3] On locus as one of the six "circumstances" of significance for the allegorical and tropological interpretation of scripture, cf. De scripturis, XIV and XV, MPL 175:21AB and 23BD.

Babylon foreshadow the common fate of mankind in the Fall.[1] The pattern of the Exodus wanderings, Egypt, Sinai and the desert, and the Promised Land, offers a type of the Christian life as a pilgrimage toward the celestial homeland.[2] It also offers an allegory of the structure of history: *ante legem* (Egypt); *sub legem* (desert and Sinai); *gratia* (Promised Land).[3]

In discussing the relationship of time and place in connection with the *mappa mundi* we are alluding to one of the major functions of the symbolic Ark of Noah. The polyvalent symbol of the Ark represented, among other things, the succession of times and thus the progression of significant events in history from the Creation until the Consummation."Into it [the Ark] is woven the story of events . . . ."[1] "Thus the length of the Ark is measured in time . . . . Or again . . . think of the length as deeds . . . ."[2] However, before we turn to a descriptive analysis of the structure and symbolism of the Ark, other aspects of the relationship of the machina and the Lord must be noted.

---

[1] "Egypt is south of Jerusalem and Babylon is north; Egypt means 'darkness' and the south wind is hot. So Egypt signifies this world, that is set in the darkness of ignorance and the heat of carnal concupiscence. Any Babylon means 'confusion', and signifies hell . . . . And we read . . . the Hebrews first served in Egypt . . . . and [later] were led off captive into Babylon. And what else does this fact suggest to us if not the fall of the whole human race, which, being exiled from its heavenly country through original sin, is first subjected to the vices through its ignorance and lust . . . , and then when [this life] is over, is taken prisoner to the pains of hell . . . ." *A. morl.*, IV, 18, MPL 176:678AB, Sq., p. 148.

[2] Cf. *DVM*, IV, MPL 176:738D where Hugh speaks of monastic fathers as leading the people of God "through the desert of the world toward the land of promise". Concerning Alexandrian exegesis of the Exodus, J. Danielou, *Shadows*, p. 226, says: "The general line of approach . . . sees in the march of the Jews from the Red Sea to Sinai through the desert a type of the journey of the Christian soul to God . . . ." On the interpretation of the Exodus as a type, cf. *ibid.*, 153-226. "Exile" and "perigrination" were important motifs in monastic asceticism. cf. J. Leclercq, *Aux sources*, pp. 35-90.

[3] *A. myst.*, XIII, MPL 176:699D: "The people of God move spiritually from the Egypt of the natural law, through the desert of the written law, toward the Promised Land of grace." On the three-fold structure of history, cf. *infra*.

Hugh described the arms of the Lord as extended so that they appeared to encompass all things.[3] By this he meant that the figure of Christ embraced the whole "machina of the universe". By showing Christ in this manner, Hugh effected a symbolic representation of the present rule of divine providence in the scheme of human history. That such an interpretation is proper for the drawing is shown by a comment in De arca Noe morali.[4] Reflecting upon the numerous and continual temporal vissicitudes of the earthly church, Hugh likened the church to a vessel buffeted by stormy waves. The church is attacked from without by unbelievers and racked inwardly by noxious fumes as the result of the perfidy of false believers. But the church is secure even in her distress:

> The fact that the arms of the Lord embrace all things on every side means that all things are under His control, and that no man can escape either the reward of His right hand or the punishment of His left.[5]

Without knowledge of the drawing this might appear to be only a pious affirmation. Related to the drawing it vividly evokes the vital themes of Providence and Judgment. These were portrayed symbolically as the Lord simultaneously embraced the cosmos in his oustretched arms and grasped the throne and scepter of the final Judgment.

---

[1] A. morl., IV, 21, MPL 176:680B, Sq., p. 152.

[2] DVM, II, MPL 176: 717C, Müller, p. 44. [3] A. myst., XV, MPL 176:702A.

[4] A. morl., I, 10, MPL 176:625D-626A, Sq., p. 58. [5] Ibid., 626A.

Clarity concerning the relationship between the machina universitatis and the figure of Christ is absolutely necessary. One recent introduction to the Ark treatises has totally misconstrued the relationship. Aelred Squire has described the iconograph associated with the Ark treatises as a drawing in which Christ "surrounded by angels sits enthroned . . . . In His hand he holds a sphere . . . ."[1] The sphere which Squire places in the hand of the Lord turns out to be the machina universitatis which we have just described. This is not the relationship between the figure of Christ and the machina which emerges upon a close and careful consideration of the text in both of the Ark treatises.

It is impossible for the figure of Christ to hold a sphere in either hand. He holds a scepter in one hand and a throne in the other. Furthermore, De arca Noe mystica clearly states that the figure of the seated Christ is covered from His shoulders to His feet by the construct of the machina.[2] The same position is supported by De arca Noe morali.[3] On the basis of our analysis this far, we may sum up the major features of the drawing as follows.. In the drawing, Christ sits enthroned with his arms spread out. Only his arms, head and feet are visible. His body is covered by the machina universitatis. Two seraphs veil His head and the feet and their own bodies as well. Hierarchical ranks of angels on either side of the seated figure gaze upward in contemplative rapture. Within the machina universitatis and just above the feet of Christ there is a vivid portrayal of the Last Judgment while the Lord holds a scepter and throne which extend from his hands to the scene of judgment at His feet. From the mouth of the Lord, the Creative Word, a chain of six discs extends downward, representing the works of the six days of Creation.

---

[1] SSW, p. 32. [2] C. XV, MPL 176:702A.

[3] I, 10, MPL 176:625D, Sq., p. 58. "This is the ark, of which we have set out to speak; and it reaches from the head to the feet [of the Lord]. . . ." The Ark was set in the center of the machina universitatis, so the machina must have covered the body also.

In the center of the machina universitatis rests the Ark of Noah.. Around it Hugh placed the mappa mundi and concentric circles representing the aer, with the four seasons and their harmonious interplay of essential characteristics, along with the twelve winds, and the aether with the months and zodiacal signs in proper correlation.

Such was the drawing which Hugh placed before his students in the cloister of St. Victor. Its implications will be explored after we have reconstructed the central figure, the Ark of Noah.

The structure of the Ark which Hugh described was exceedingly complex. To read De arca Noe mystica is to become convinced of the tremendous quantity of iconographic "cargo" carried by the Ark.[1] The question may be posed: Did the drawing exist in any concrete form? The question of existence cannot be answered with the present evidence. It can only be said that such a drawing does not exist now.[2] However, De arca

---

[1] Cf. E. K. Rand, Founders of the Middle Ages (Cambridge, Mass., 1928), p. 90: "Hugo has introduced many modern improvements in the ancient craft, but it is the same old boat, patiently carrying whatever spiritual cargo was put aboard."

[2] Neither the Indiculum of Hugh's works, published by Ghellinck, "La table . . .," RSR, I (1910), 270ff., nor Haureau, Les oeuvres . . . ., nor the manuscript studies by Baron have revealed the existence of such a drawing. Cf. p. 52, n. 1 of the English trans. of A. morl.: "If Hugh drew this picture, it has unfortunately not survived." The notes are not always trustworthy on the drawing, however. Note 3, p. 63 says the pyramidal structure described is not the drawing mentioned earlier (Bk. I, c. 7, p. 52). The note is wrong. The drawing is the same one in both cases.

Noe morali presupposes an actual drawing, and one must conclude either that a drawing existed or that Hugh used subtle literary devices to deceive his readers.[1] Furthermore, there is the second treatise, which describes the way in which Hugh drew the figures of Christ, the machina, and the Ark.

De arca Noe mystica began with the artist's decision to draw: "First I find the centre of the flat surface where I mean to draw the ark. There, having fixed the point, I draw round it a small square . . . ."[2] It continued with repeated descriptions of how lines were to be placed, inscriptions to be made, and figures to be drawn.

Perhaps an hypothesis concerning the nature of the drawing may be proposed by suggesting that the drawing of the Ark was so large that its presence in any collection of Hugh's works was effectively precluded. The prose description of the drawing offered in De arca Noe mystica would serve as a readily copied and easily portable "reproduction" of the larger drawing.

A practice from mid-and late-twelfth century Paris classrooms may provide a clue in support of this suggestion of a large-scale drawing, suitable for didactic purposes but not suitable for easy preservation. We know that the Compendium Historiae in Genealogia Christi, by Peter of Poitiers, was inscribed on an animal skin and hung on the wall of the classroom so that students might make use of it.[1] Perhaps Hugh also drew his iconograph on a skin which he suspended on a wall in the cloister of St. Victor when talking about the Ark of Noah. It would not be surprising if such a device were neither copied nor preserved.

---

[1] Cf. supra, 117 for typical statements. In such statements as these, de Lubac, EM, II, i, 323, sees marks of the subjectivity of Hugh's drawing.

[2] C. I, MPL, 176:681A. [Trans. Smalley, SBMA, p. 96.]

Whatever the format of the drawing, Hugh has left us enough clues in the two treatises on the Ark to enable a rather complete reconstruction of the sketch of the Ark and a description of the use which he made of this symbolic structure.

Hugh drew the Ark as if he were looking down upon it from above. Thus the longitudinal and latitudinal features of the vessel were readily accessible to view. The problem which Hugh then faced was that of making the vertical structure visible. This was done by adopting a form for the superstructure which consisted of a truncated, four-sided pyramid.[2] As we shall show later, in the drawing we do not have the structure of the Ark which Hugh developed in his exegesis of the Noachic material ad litteram.[1] The form given to the Ark in the drawing was made necessary by certain iconographic limitations. The chief problem was presenting a three-dimensional object in a single two dimensional view. That Hugh was capable of achieving this goal and maintaining clarity in his drawing is a tribute to his creativity.

---

[1] Cf. P. S. Moore, The Works of Peter of Poitiers (Georgetown, 1936), p. 108, n. 20. Cited by Smalley, SBMA, p. 215. On the Compendium in general, cf. Moore, pp. 96-117. In many mss. the Compendium is placed as a preface to the Historia scholastica of Peter Comestor; cf. Smalley, p. 215. This brings us within the sphere of influence of the victorine exegetical tradition. Peter Comestor, Peter the Chanter, and Stephen Langton were responsible for continuing the victorine tradition in the schools of Paris. Cf. Smalley, c. 5, for the best study of the subject. Cf. the important studies by Grabmann, GSM, II, 476-501, and C. A. Robson, Maurice of Sully (Oxford, 1952). The latter work deals with the sermons of Maurice of Sully and their relationship to the Historia scholastica of Peter Comestor and the Allegoriae included in Richard of St. Victor's Liber exceptionum. Apparently the Allegoriae and the Historia were conceived as a joint project; cf. Robson, "The Pecia of the Twelfth-Century Paris School," Dominican Studies, II (1949), 262-79. For the text of the Historia, cf. MPL 198:1053ff. The Liber exceptionum has been edited by J. Chatillon, with an important introduction. Cf. also his article, "Le Contenu, l'Authenticité, et la Date du Liber Exceptionum et des Sermones Centum de Richard de Saint-Victor," RMAL, IV (1948), 23-52.

[2] Hugh described it in this manner: "We have depicted this form in preference to the other, because we were unable to show the height of the walls in a flat drawing. For in this plan the ascending beams are gradually brought together until they meet in the measure of a single cubit." A. morl., I, 13, MPL 176:629D.

By drawing a vessel on which the sides of the superstructure sloped inward, Hugh worked out a successful solution for his iconographic dilemma. The drawing easily showed the relationship between the various floors of the Ark since each successively higher floor was smaller than its predecessor. The result was a set of nesting rectangles. By connecting the corresponding corners of the rectangles in the set, Hugh was able to represent the 'space' between the levels of the Ark and the transition from one level to the next.[2] Drawing the Ark in this manner was the only effective way to represent the height of the superstructure while also showing the horizontal dimensions. If he had employed a side view, the vertical disposition of the elements of the structure would have been clear, but then it would have been impossible to represent the other three sides of the vessel without an absolute distortion of the figure.

---

1. On the question of the relationship of the literal exegesis of the Noachic material and the drawing of the Ark, cf. infra, pp. 176 ff.

2. For the process of drawing the floors, etc., cf. A. myst., If., MPL 176:682D-684C. Apparently Hugh distorted the length-width ratio in order to provide a more useful figure. Cf. ibid., I, 682CD. The six-to-one ratio demanded by the proper proportions would have made the Ark long and narrow. Hugh needed something with more breadth to effectively include all of the iconographic material. The length was indicated numerically; however, cf. ibid., VI, 691C.

As indicated above, the Ark of Noah was placed in the iconograph so that it rested in the center of the *machina universitatis*, surrounded by the map of the world and the remainder of the symbolic cosmos. Placed in that manner, the Ark was superimposed upon the body of the Christ-figure, with the prow of the vessel pointing toward the head of the figure while the stern was near His feet.[1] The chain of six discs representing the six days of creation terminated at the bow of the Ark where a small drawing representing Paradise was placed.[2] Also at the bow of the Ark Hugh drew a small square "for the purpose of indicating the four parts of the earth."[3] The letters ADAM were placed on the square, one letter to each side. They were related to the Greek names for the four cardinal compass points.[4] Thus the name of the first man foreshadowed the dispersion of mankind over the face of the earth: "Rightly the first parent, who in his offspring has been spread over all parts of the earth, received the elements of his name from the four parts of the earth."[5] Striking by its absence is the theme of the correlation of *microcosmos-macrocosmos* through the association of the four elements of earth, air, fire, and water with Adam.[6]

---

[1] *A. myst.*, XIV, MPL 176:700CD, and *A. morl.*, I, 10, MPL 176:625CD, Sq., p. 58.

[2] *A. myst.*, XIV, MPL 176:700D. [3] *Ibid.*, III, 686A.

[4] A: Anatole, ανατολή (east); D: Dysis δύσις (west); A: Arctos, ἄρκτος (north); M: Mesembria μεσημβρία (south). Cf. *Ibid.*, 686AB.

[5] *Ibid.*, 686B. Augustine has a similar interpretation stressing the scattering of humanity to the four winds; cf. *Ps. 195*, n. 15, MPL 37:1236, quoted in de Lubac, *Catholicism*, p. 213.

[6] Augustine also lacks this cosmic reference, cf. *supra*, n. 5. For man as a *microcosmos*, cf. pl. XVI of the *Hortus deliciarum*, ed. Straub and Keller; also Bede, *In Gen.*, IV, MPL 91:216.

In the center of the Ark Hugh drew a square the size of one cubit to represent the column which was set in the center of the Ark in order to support the entire superstructure of the vessel. Throughout the mystical interpretation of the Ark structure this column was related to the person of Christ.[1] Around the sides of the vessel Hugh drew six small chambers (*mansiunculae*) to provide dwelling places for those animals which were unable to live either wholly in the water or wholly out of it.[2]

In his allegorical interpretation of the Ark, Hugh found in the Ark a type of the Church. In this he paralleled centuries of Christian exegesis.[3] However, in interpreting the Ark as a type of the Church Hugh departed from the traditional approach which stressed certain ecclesiological and sacramental motifs. From the time of Tertullian onward, the common allegorical interpretation of the Ark and the flood had taken the Ark as a type of the institutional, hierarchical church "outside of which there is no salvation".[4] In a similar manner the waters of the flood foreshadowed the waters of baptism. As Noah and his family were saved in the waters of the flood by means of the wood of the Ark, so the Christian is saved by the wood of the cross through the waters of baptism.[1] Hugh was aware of these traditional allegories.[2] But he developed a more dynamic interpretation of the Ark as a type of the church. His allegory emphasized the dynamic aspect of the life of the Church rather than the static hierarchical and sacramental dimensions of the institution.[3] Not the visible embodiment of grace, outside of which there is no salvation, but the historic community of believers in all periods of time occupied Hugh's attention when he spoke of the Church in the Ark treatises.

---

[1] "The pillar.set up in the middle of the ark to the height of thirty cubits, to which the entire structure leans . . . is . . . our Lord Jesus Christ, set up in the midst of His Church . . . ." *A. morl.*, II, 8, MPL 176:640C.

[2] *A. myst.*, XIII, MPL 176:698D-699A. The problem of providing for amphibians was raised, but not solved, in the Pseudo-Augustinian treatise, *De mirabilibus sacrae scripturae*, I, 5, MPL 35:2156. Cf. Smalley, *SBMA*, p. 96.

[3] For a penetrating summary of patristic exegesis of the Noachic material, cf. Danielou, *Shadows*, pp, 69-114. Cf. also *DACL*, I, ii, 2709ff., and H. Rahner, "Das Schiff aus Holz," ZKT, XLVII (1943), 1-21, cited in his *Greek Myths and Christian Mystery* (New York, 1963), p. 61, n. 2.

[4] *De bapt.*, VIII, MPL 1:1317. Cf. Daniélou, *Shadows*, pp. 98ff., "This is the typology, established by Tertullian, that we shall find right through the tradition." (p. 99) For a condensed summary of typological motifs associated with the Ark, cf. *DACL*, I, ii, 2719-20 with notes.

Hugh found the temporal dimensions of the life of the Church limned in the dimensions of the Ark.[4] The three hundred cubit length of the Ark symbolized the three periods into which history is divided: Natural law, written law, and grace. The fifty cubit width of the Ark signified the unity of all believers under the headship of Christ. Finally, the height of the Ark, thirty cubits, symbolically indicated the thirty books of Holy Writ which contained "all that God has done, is doing and will do for His elect." In each case, traditional number symbolism was utilized to throw into relief the temporal dimension of the life of the Church.

---

[1] Cf. Daniélou, Shadows, pp. 91ff. The fathers build this typology on I Pet. 3:20f.

[2] Hugh gathered together all of the major typological themes associated with Noah and the Ark in DVM, III, MPL 176:725D-726C. There we find the eschatological, sacramental, ecclesiological, and christological themes noted by Daniélou in his study of the fathers.

[3] This contrast has been developed by Chatillon, "Une ecclesiologie . . .," Irenikon, XXII (1949), 115-138, 395-411. Hugh's allegory of the Ark also had static elements. Cf. the use of the three stories of the Ark to prefigure the three levels of believers in the Church, A. morl., I, 14, MPL 176:630B.

[4] A. morl., I, 14, MPL 176:629A-630B. Cf. A. myst., III, MPL 176:685.

In order to show the existence of the Church in time, Hugh depicted the course of history along the keel of the Ark. Since the Ark is the Church, the length of the Ark is the "length" of the Church.[1] Hugh found this latter length in the existence of the church from the beginning of the world until the end of the same. There has never been a time, he said, in which there have not been men faithful to Christ.[2] The Church as the communion of all faithful men has existed in all periods of history.

The flow of time was shown in the Ark drawing by inscribing along the centerline of the Ark the genealogy of Christ and the list of successors in the bishopric of Rome.[3] No resume of history was intended; only an indication of the course of time and the significant difference between the time before the Incarnation of the Word and that which followed.

The genealogy of Christ was a combination of the genealogies given in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke.[1] When the list of names reached Judah, the series was interrupted by a band of twelve discs placed laterally across the Ark. On these medallions figures were drawn "from the chest up" in order to represent the twelve patriarchs. Hugh informed his readers that "the Greeks often call these [discs with pictures] Icons . . . ."[2] Thus the patriarchs were arranged so that they appeared to be "like the senate (senatus) of the city of God."[3]

---

[1] "If the Ark signifies the Church, it remains true that the length of the Ark symbolizes the length of the Church. However, the length of the Church is to be found in the duration of times . . . . The length of it consists in the increase of times, which extend from the past, through the present, into the future." A. myst., III, MPL 176:685AB.

[2] Ibid. Cf. Dialogus, MPL 176:32B. Squire, SSW, p. 58, n. 1, considers Hugh's idea that the Church has existed since creation to be a return "to a patristic tradition older than that of Augustine, as for instance, Origen . . . ."

[3] A. myst., IV, MPL 176:686C-687D.

At the outset of the "genealogy" of the Popes, Hugh drew another series of twelve discs transversely in the Ark.[4] Again, "icons" were drawn to indicate the twelve men. These twelve discs represent the twelve apostles. The list of Popes continued from Peter to Honorius II.[5] Together with the genealogy of Christ, the list of Popes served to represent the history of the whole people of God through the three periods of time from the creation until Hugh's day.

---

[1] The line of generation from Adam to Abraham agreed with Luke 3:22-38 with one exception: Hugh omitted Cainan between Arphaxad and Shelah. (We follow the RSV spelling here; for the pecularities of Hugh's Hebrew orthography, cf. R. Baron, "Hughes de Saint-Victor ...," *Cultura Neolatina*, XVI (1956), 117ff.) The second part of the genealogy, from Judah to Ahaz, followed Matthew 1:2ff. with several exceptions. First, Hugh had Ephrom for Hezron. Second Hugh had Isai, not Jesse, as the father of David. The *Glossa ordinaria* explained this: "The father of David often is called Isai, for he had two names." (MPL 114:67.) Third, Hugh included names not present in the Matthean genealogy. After Joram (Matt. 1:8) Hugh inserted "Aazias, Joas, Amazias, Ozias . . . ." The *Glossa* had no such insertion. Bede, however, gave the names and then explained why they are to be excluded. Cf. *In Matthaei Evangelius, Expositio*, I, 1, MPL 92:10AB. The third part of the genealogy, from Hezekiah to Joseph agreed with Matthew except for one portion. Where the text of Matthew reads Jeconiah and Shealtiel Hugh's genealogy read "Eliachim, Joachim, Salathiel . . . ."

[2] *A. myst.*, IV, MPL 176:686D. Similar devices are found in the *Hortus deliciarum*, cf. Mâle, *Gothic Image*, p. 380, fig. 184.

[3] *Ibid.* [4] *A. myst.*, IV, MPL 176:687A.

[5] The list of Popes provides one problem. In the present list, as in *DS*, II, ix, 2, MPL 176:473A, Def., p. 316, and in *DVM* IV, MPL 176:736D-737A, Hugh declared Clement to be the successor of Peter. The *Chronicon* twice presented the succession Peter-Linus-Cletus-Clement. For the solution of the problem cf. van den Eynde, *Essai*, pp. 88ff. where the *Chronicon* is taken as a later point of view than the two treatises and the section of *DS* is shown to be an excerpt from traditional material and thus not necessarily reflecting Hugh's precise viewpoint.

The distinction of the two genealogies emphasized the difference between the two peoples of God, those who have gone before and those who follow after the Incarnate Word.[1] Those who preceeded Christ are the "antique people" (antiquus populus) of the written law. They are descended from the twelve patriarchs according to the flesh. Those who follow after the Christ are the people of the new law, i.e. of grace. They are descended from the twelve apostles by a line of spiritual filiation. Yet these two people were finally one in their loyalty and their goal. Those going before and those going after comprise the one people of God, who are making the pilgrimage to the city of the great king, which is the city of God.[2] In De sacramentis christianae fidei Hugh presented the same thought of unity in another image.[3] Christ the King leads his people in battle against the devil, backing Satan to defeat down the long corridors of history. There are those soldiers who have gone before their king and those who follow after him. But both fight under the same banner and in the same army, with equally effective arms and weapons, found in the sacraments, which have changed from age to age but which have always been effective in their time.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., 687AB. [2] Ibid., VI, 691Dfin.

[3] I, prol, 2, and viii, 11, MPL 176:183B and 312BD, Def., pp. 3f. and 148ff. Cf. Petry, "Three medieval chroniclers . . .," CH, XXXIV (1965), pp. 282ff.

[4] On Hugh's sacramental doctrine cf. Weisweiller, Wirksamkeit. Also, cf. infra, c. IV for our analysis.

With the patriarchs and apostles arranged so that they were grouped around the column symbolizing Christ, Hugh's vision suddenly shifted from the line of history to the eschaton. The twenty-four patriarchs and apostles foreshadow the twenty-four elders of the Revelation of St. John as they gather around the throne of the lamb in celestial adoration.[1] The bare outline of history, seen aright, contains foreshadowings of that city of peace and joy to which the people of God are journeying.

The Revelation of St. John provided the basic imagery for some of the church portals in the early middle ages and we find some of the basic images repeated in the structure of the Ark, in addition to the twenty-four elders.[2] Symbols of the four evangelists were placed around the column in the center of the Ark.[3] In the center of the square representing the column a year-old lamb was drawn, symbolizing the Lamb of God of the Apocalypse.[4]

Along the length of the Ark, parallel to Christ's genealogy and the list of Popes, Hugh drew a band which he divided into three segments.[5] This represented the three periods into which history was divided. First came the period of the natural law, then the written law, and finally the period of grace. The transition points were marked by the twelve patriarchs and the Incarnation of the Word.[6] This scheme was a traditional manner of dividing history for writers in patristic and medieval times.[1] It formed the basic structure for Hugh's sacramental theology and for the sequence of material in De sacramentis christianae fidei.[2]

---

[1] A. myst., IV, MPL 176:687AB. Cf. Rev. 4:4.

[2] On the theme of the Apocalypse in medieval art, cf. Mâle, L'Art rel. au xii^{e} S., pp. 377-97, and Gothic Image, pp. 355-65.

[3] A. myst., VIII, MPL 176:696AB. Cf. Rev. 4:6ff.

[4] Ibid., I, 681C. Cf. Rev. 5:6. [5] Cf. A. myst., V, MPL 176:688Aff.

[6] Ibid., 688B. Cf. De script., XVII, MPL 175:24C, where the shift from natural to written law is not made clear, and DS, I, xii, 1, MPL 176: 347D, Def., p. 187, where the transition from the time of the natural law to that of the written law seems to be with Abraham.

In Hugh's thought, a three-fold division of humanity was correlated with the three-fold division of history. There are men of the natural law, men of the written law, and men of grace.[3] These divisions of humanity have reference to the historical periods, but they are not purely historical categories. The three kinds, or genera, of men are in actuality three modes of existence in the world.[4] In each period of world history, there have been men of each type.[5] But, in a given period, the men characteristic of that period have been dominant by their number, or, as in the case of men of grace in the third period of history, by virtue of their "more excellent status."

The men of the natural law are men who live either by the natural impulses of desire characteristic of fallen man or by the guidance of the small "spark" of reason which man has retained following the fall.[1] The man of the natural law is a man who is wholly autonomous. He lives by his inner impulses and designs, which are under the shadow of the fallen state of man. In connection with his analysis of natural man, Hugh recognized three meanings of the word "nature" in Scripture.[2] Nature may refer to the integral and uncorrupt good in which the first man was created. In this sense we may say that all nature is good. Secondly, nature may refer to the corruption of sin in which man is born, according to the words of Paul, "We are by nature children of wrath". (Eph. 2:3) The third meaning of the word may have reference to the "remnant of that good nature which remains in man after sin".[3] Man retains a spark [scintilla] of natural reason in his mind, by which he may discern good and evil. From this analysis Hugh then defined the characteristics of the life of men of the natural law, as we have outlined them.

---

[1] On the three-fold scheme, cf. A. Luneau, L'histoire du salut chez les peres de l'Eglise. La doctrine des ages du monde ("Theologie historique," 6; Paris, 1966), and Schneider, Geschichte, c. VII, "Die Epochen der Geschichte."

[2] Cf. Weisweiller, Wirksamkeit, pp. 23ff., and Schlette, "Die Eucharistielehre . . .," ZKT, LXXXI (1959), 77ff. Also, Baron, Sci. et Sg., pp. 133ff.

[3] A. myst., V, MPL 176:688Cff. Cf. Dialogus, MPL 176:32BD and DS, I, viii, 11, MPL 176:312D-313C, Def., pp. 148-50. The Dialogus simplifies and condenses the material from A. myst., cf. van den Eynde, Essai, pp. 80-82. The Dialogus, followed by DS, also identifies the men of the natural law with pagans, those of the written law with Jews, and those of grace with Christians.

[4] Schlette, "Die Eucharistielehre . . .," ZKT LXXXI (1959), 79: "The three genera mean not merely a division of history--although such is not excluded--, they indicate rather classes [Stande], conditions [Verfassungen] of mankind . . . ."

[5] A. myst., V, MPL 176:688C.

The men of the written law are those men who "receive their form of life either from the traditions of Scripture or from precepts which are right and good."[4] The men of the written law follow a pattern set for them by an external standard. With the giving of the Mosaic Law this pattern was embodied in that Law. Before that time they imitated the good which they observed being practiced by the men who were truly men of grace. At all times, then, the men of the written law are characterized basically by an attempt to conform to an external standard. They are "fictiously good."

---

[1] Ibid., 689AB.

[2] Ibid., 689A. Cf. van den Eynde, Essai, pp. 76f. for the relationship of this passage to other writings by Hugh.

[3] A. myst., V, MPL 176:689A. [4] Ibid., 689B.

The men of grace are those men "in whose hearts charity is diffused by the Holy Spirit which has been given to them".[1] They are illuminated by the Spirit so that they understand what ought to be done and are helped so that they may fulfill the good. Although this mode of existence is characteristic of the men who live in the time of grace, men inspired by the Spirit have lived in every age.

Hugh chose to illustrate the co-existence of the three kinds of men in the period of the natural law.[2] Men of grace were present, but basically unknown by the world. The Spirit inflamed them to love God for Himself. He spoke with them outwardly and inspired them inwardly. Men of the written law patterned their lives after the good example set by the men of grace. Men of the natural law lived totally according to their "natural" impulses and reason.

With the coming of the written law, the number of men of the natural law decreased. As the time of grace drew nearer the men of grace were more obvious.[3] With the advent of Christ and the period of grace, the men of grace were elevated to a more excellent status.[4] In a note of historical realism Hugh admitted that the men of the natural law increased and the men of grace were in truth much in the minority in the time of grace. "This time is called the time of grace because now the men of grace, although they are not many in number, are more excellent in status."[5]

---

[1] Ibid., 689BC. On the work of the Holy Spirit, cf. DS, II, ii, 1, MPL 176:415CD, Def., pp. 253f: "Therefore, the Spirit was given in fire that it might have light and flame; light unto knowledge, flame unto love". The Spirit effects knowledge and virtue.

[2] This assumes an emendation of the printed text of A. myst. At chap. V, MPL 176:689C,ℓ.5, insert "naturae" so that it reads: "in tempore naturae legis . . ."

[3] Ibid., 690B. [4] Ibid., 690C. [5] Ibid.

To signify the presence of the three types of men in all historical periods, the band representing the three periods of history was divided into three lengthwise strips. In each of the three periods the strips were painted to indicate the relative prominence of the three types.[1]

Hugh also schematized the relationship of the three types of men to the Church.[2] Men of the natural law are outside the Church if they lack faith; they are in it if they have faith. But they lack works. Men of the written law are in the Church by faith but are not of the Church because they are not truly good. They conform outwardly by works, but lack inner charity. Men of grace alone are in the Church through faith and of the church through true goodness, i.e. the possession of charity. Men of the natural law are openly evil; men of the written law, fictiously good; men of grace, truly good.

Included in the structure of the Ark and the mappa mundi was a representation of the wanderings of the tribes of Israel in their journey from Egypt to the Promised Land.[3] The River Jordan flowed laterally through the Ark, between the last name in the genealogy of Christ and the side of the column.[4] Along the southern wall of the Ark the forty-two mansiones, or resting places in the wilderness, were shown.[5] They stretched from the bank of the river Jordan to a point opposite the location of Egypt on the mappa mundi which surrounded the Ark. Hugh used miniature figures to point out the progress of the Hebrew people on this journey.

---

[1] A. myst., V, MPL 176:690D-691B. [2] Ibid., 690CD.

[3] Ibid., XIII and XIV, 699A-700C.

[4] As a type of baptism, the Jordan represents the transition from the time of the written law to the time of grace. Cf. Ibid., XIII, 699B. Cf. Danielou, Shadows, pp. 225ff. for the typological use of the Jordan by the fathers.

[5] Ibid., XIV, 700AB. The Chronicon also contained a list of these, cf. Green, "De tribus diebus . . . ," Speculum, XVIII (1943), 492.

Also depicted on the Ark was the Exile to Babylon, again with miniature figures. Hugh located the line of movement so that the migration began at the name of Joachim on the genealogy of Christ and continued at a descending angle until it exited from the Ark adjacent to Babylon on the mappa mundi.[1]

Hugh intended to write another treatise in which he would present the mystical interpretation of the forty-two resting places in the wilderness and would explain why Egypt was compared to the natural law; the desert, to the written law; and the promised land, to grace.[2] The work was never written.

The major symbolic role of the column which stood in the middle of the Ark to support the superstructure centered on the representation of Christ Who is the "Tree of Life" and the "Book of Life".[3] Hugh remained firm in his adherence to the total unity of the divine and human in the person of Christ.[4] Yet he spoke of Christ as being "for us the Book of Life according to the humanity that He has taken, since as man He gives us an example".[5] In His divinity, Christ can be thought of as the "Tree of

---

[1] A. myst., IX, MPL 176:696C. [2] Ibid., XIV 700C.

[3] Cf. A. myst., II, MPL 176:684, and A. morl., II, 11, MPL 176:642C-643B, Sq., pp. 86f.

[4] On Hugh's christology, cf. Poppenberg, Die Christologie, Poppenberg's use of historical and ontological categories has been questioned by Schlette, "Die Eucharistielehre . . . ," ZKT, LXXXI (1959), p. 73, n. 14 and p. 74, n. 23.

[5] A. morl., II, 11, MPL 176:643A, Sq., p. 87. Cf. A. myst., I, MPL 176:682A.

Life . . .since in virtue of His Godhead He supplies us with a remedy."[1] The example which Christ has rendered is in the humility of his Incarnation, but he also is the one who calls man back to God now that man is blind and deaf to the revelation of God in creation.[2] The remedy which Christ supplies by virtue of His divinity is mediated primarily through the sacraments and is fulfilled in the contemplative life. Hugh's sacramental doctrine took up the Augustinian motif that sin is a sickness and the sacraments mediate the healing grace of God.[3] In his divinity Christ also "feeds" men, by which Hugh had reference to the contemplative life.

The "Tree of Life" was associated with the south side of the column, and the "Book of Life" was associated with the north side.[4] To symbolize the book and tree, Hugh used colors and iconographic motifs. The sides of the column were represented by coloring strips extending from the cubit at the top of the Ark to the sides of the Ark, as if the the bottom of the column had been swung outward.[5]

---

1. Ibid.

2. Cf. supra, p. 151, n. 5. Also, cf. A. morl., IV, 9f., MPL 176:669A-670B, 671BC, Sq., pp. 132-34, 136.

3. Cf. Weisweiller, Wirksamkeit, esp. pp. 11-22.Cf., e.g., DS, I, viii, 12 and ix, 4, MPL 176:313C-314A and 323, Def.,pp. 150f. and 160.

4."We . . . have inscribed 'The Tree of Life' upon the south side, and 'The Book of Life' upon the north." A. morl., II, 11, MPL 176:643A, Sq., p. 87. Cf. A. myst., II, MPL 176:684AB.

5. A. myst., II, MPL 176:684BC.

To indicate the "Book of Life" Hugh drew a hand extending down from the peak of the Ark.[1] In the hand were two books, one symbolizing rebuke for pride, the other with an inscription to indicate the beginning of the knowledge of God. The inscription in the first book was "Woe, woe, woe." (Rev. 8:13) The second book bore the first verse of Genesis: "In the beginning God created Heaven and earth." On the side corresponding to the "Book of Life" the names of the thirty books of Scripture were written, with ten books in each level of the Ark.[2]

The "Tree of Life" was symbolized by a branch extending downward on the south side of the Ark.[3] The branch was covered with leaves and fruit, showing the two-fold function of the Lord who is the "Tree of Life." On the one hand, He shades those who are beset by the heat of the vices; on the other hand, He feeds those who are enlightened and are advancing on the contemplative way.

As we shall see the functions of "Book" and "Tree" were associated with the four ascents of man's restoration. The "Book" was related to the ascents from pride and ignorance. The "Tree" was related to the ascent from concupiscence and to the ascent which Hugh described as no longer being away from the vices but toward ever greater virtue.

---

[1] Ibid., VIII, 696B.

[2] A. morl., II, 11, MPL 176:642D, Sq., p. 87.

[3] A. myst., VIII, MPL 176:696B. Cf. A. morl., II, 11, MPL 176:643A, Sq., p. 87.

In the structure of the Ark the ascension motif centered upon the four timbers which rose from the four corners of the Ark and terminated in the cubit at the summit of the vessel. Along each of these sloping timbers Hugh drew a series of three ladders connecting the three levels of the Ark. In connection with these ladders Hugh drew figures and scenes to depict visually man's return from the distraction of the world to the unific experience of the love of God and the fore-taste of the eternal visio.[1]

The four ascents were keyed to the four cardinal points of the compass represented on the mappa mundi.[2] This reflects the view that directions have mystical significance. Since the ascents were from the corners of the Ark, they were from points mid-way between the major compass points. Thus Hugh spoke of the ascents as being from the heat and cold of the east and west. North was associated with darkness, coldness, and the Devil. The south could connote either the heat of spiritual fervor or the raging flames of sensual lust. The east was the place of man's good beginning, i.e. paradise. The west again symbolized a place of darkness as well as the last judgment. When correlated, these mystical significations yielded a structured diagram of the nature of the Fall and the path man must follow for his restoration. For, while it is true that God could immediately translate man from this world of sin and suffering to the glory of eternal life, He has chosen to bring man back along the path by which he has departed.[1] In this way man will realize the extent of his sin and the arduous nature of his return and the sacrifice involved.[2]

---

[1] The pages which follow describe these ladders and figures.

[2] The most succinct summaries of the directional symbolism involved here are found in A. morl., II, 9 and 10, MPL 176:640D-641B and 642BC, Sq., pp. 83f. and 85f. For directional symbolism in medieval iconography in general, cf. Reau, Iconographie, I, 69-72.

The first three ascents were related to the three guilts resulting from man's primal disobedience of God's will.[3] The first ascent was made from the cold of the East (_a frigore orientis_) and was from pride.[4] The second ascent, in which man treads his "fleshly vices" underfoot, was from the heat of the west (_a calore occidentis_) and marked the flight from concupiscence. The third ascent was from the cold of the west (_a frigore occidentis_). In this ascent man turns from blind ignorance, seeking the Wisdom which comes from God.

After the three ascents marking the initial movement and continuing activity of return from the impulse of pride which led to the fall and from the debilitating effects of concupiscence and ignorance, man may advance from the good to the better. This is the final ascent from the heat of the east (_a calore orientis_). This is the final ascent of man toward God. Having humbled pride, having left vices for virtue, and having begun to dispel the clouds of ignorance, man may begin the last ascension which leads to the summit.

---

[1] _A. morl._, IV, 5, MPL 176:666C-667A. [2] _Ibid._, and also I, 2, 619/20.

[3] Hugh was a strict Augustinian in his doctrine of the Fall. He gave equal emphasis to ignorance and concupiscence as results of man's initial act of disobedience. Cf. _DS_, I, viii, 1, MPL 176:305CD, Def., p. 141, for a concise statement of Hugh's position. In the schools of the twelfth century there was a general tendency to neglect the cognitive aspect of the Fall and to concentrate attention on concupiscence. Cf. O. Lottin, _Psychologie et Morale aux xii^e et xiii^e Siècles_ (6 vols.; Louvain/Gembloux, 1942-60), IV, 60-76, esp. pp. 65-66 on Hugh.

[4] For the ascents, cf. _A. morl._, II, 10, MPL 176:642AC, Sq., p. 85.

Hugh was not so naive as to believe that life could be ordered so a man might consider he had overcome pride, banished vice, or found full knowledge. Life in this world is never perfect and even the most spiritually advanced men stand in danger of pride and faults.[1] Indeed, God may well allow the felix culpa to bring such men back to a sense of profound humility and gratefulness.[2]

This hierarchy of ascension must always be viewed in the way in which Hugh presented the five steps to perfection in the Didascalicon. There study, meditation, prayer, performance, and contemplation were arranged in an ascending scale.[3] Yet Hugh emphasized that the more advanced did not leave the lower levels behind: "The man who is vigorous in his practice prays lest he grow weak . . . . And thus it turns out that though we always have the will to ascend, nevertheless we are sometimes forced by necessity to descend . . . ."[4]

The four sides of each story of the Ark carried inscriptions which formed four significant triads. Hugh, as one writer has observed, was "firmly persuaded that 'all good things go in threes' . . . . moving in the very rhythm of the universe".[1]

---

[1] "Let a man return to his own heart, and he will find there a stormy ocean lashed by the fierce billows of overwhelming passions and desires . . . . For there is this flood in every man, as long as he lives in this corruptible life . . . ." A. morl., IV, 16, MPL 675BC, Sq., p. 143. In ibid., III, 10, 655Cff., pp. 108ff., Hugh treats the "vice of pride and curious inquiry." Spiritual pride and superiority are much in view.

[2] Cf. Squire's remarks on this, SSW, p. 37.

[3] Did., V, 9, Butt., pp. 109ff., Tay., pp. 132f.

[4] Ibid., Butt. p. 110, Tay., p. 133.

On the north side of the three levels were placed in ascending order, faith, hope, and charity.[2] Hugh termed this a "moral" (moraliter) distinction of the three stories.[3] On the south side Hugh wrote, in ascending order, knowledge, discipline, and goodness.[4] Hugh termed this division according to the active life (secundum operationem).[5] On the east side of the Ark, toward the bow, Hugh inscribed the terms nature, written law, and grace.[6] This was the three-fold division. Finally, on the western side of the levels, Hugh wrote right, useful, and necessary.[7] In De arca Noe mystica this last triad was associated with the previous three triads to give right faith, useful hope, and necessary charity, etc. De arca Noe morali presented a different triad and termed it an "anagogical" division of the levels of the Ark: Right thought, wise meditation, and pure contemplation.[1] In the structure of the ark in *De arca Noe mystica* this sequence of thought, meditation and contemplation was the structure of the ascent from ignorance. At each corner of the Ark three ladders were placed. Hierarchically arranged triads were symbolized by each series of three ladders. Each of these three-fold ascents symbolized the interior reformation and restoration of man as he turned from love of the world to the unific love of God.

---

[1] Cf. Smalley, SBMA, pp. 86f. On Hugh's use of literary parallelism and rhythmic prose as a literary device, cf. the study by Baron in Études pp. 91-120, and p. 124: "The group which appears most frequently is the grouping according to threes. It becomes something like a category for expressing thought."

[2] A. myst., VII, MPL 176:629B.

[3] A. morl., IV, 20, MPL 176:679C, Sq., p. 151.

[4] A. myst., VII, MPL 176:629B.

[5] A. morl., IV, 20, MPL 176:679C, Sq., p. 151. Cf. ibid., II, 3, 636C, p. 75, where operatio is taken as the life of worldly concerns which may be pursued to one's betterment or detriment depending upon attitude. Operatio is there opposed to cogitatio which in context is to be understood as the contemplation of the creation, or the contemplation fit for beginners of In Eccl. homil., I, MPL 175:116ff. Cf. A. morl., II, 5-7, MPL 176:637C-639C. Cf. Lasic, pp. 264-293, and Baron Sci. et Sg., pp. 192ff.

[6] A. myst., VII, MPL 176:629B. [7] Ibid.

From the "cold of the east," i.e. from pride, the ascent was made by fear, sorrow, and love (*timor*, *dolor*, *amor*). From the "heat of the west," i.e. from concupiscence, the ascent was made by patience, mercy, and compunction (*patientia*, *misericordia*, *compunctio*). From the "cold of the west," i.e. from ignorance, the ascent was by means of knowledge, meditation, and contemplation (*cognitio*, *meditatio*, *contemplatio*). The fourth and final ascent, from the "heat of the east" or spiritual fervor (*a spiritus fervore*), was made by temperance, prudence, and fortitude (*temperantia*, *prudentia*, *fortitudo*), three of the four cardinal virtues.[2]

---

[1] *A. morl.*, IV, 20, MPL 176:679C, Sq., p. 151. This use of *anagogia* in connection with contemplative ascension is within dionysian tradition and terminology. Cf. de Lubac, *EM*, I, ii, pp. 621ff., 640ff.; also Roques, "Connaissance de Dieu . . .," *Structures Théologiques*, pp. 320 ff., and *Univers*, pp. 204ff.

[2] The description of the structure of the four ascents as described here is found in *A. myst.*, VII-X, MPL 176:692B-697D. Cf. the summary at the beginning of c. VIII, 695B. The ascensions are treated in *A. morl.*, II, 9-10, MPL 176:640D-642C, also.

In this complex symbolism of the four ascents we come to a portion of the Ark iconography in which Hugh relied very heavily on a compact and even terse grouping of images to convey his meaning. He drew upon the common iconographical currency of the period.[1] Hence he could assume a certain ability on the part of his readers to "build" upon fleeting visual allusions and to grasp clusters of ideas via one symbol. To be sure, the content transmitted by the drawing was thoroughly victorine in its essence, but the form in which the ascension motif was cast had much in common with such works as the Hortus deliciarum of Herrade of Landesberg and other medieval "picture books" with their ladders and wagons peopled with personifications of the virtues and vices.[2] It is quite possible that Hugh was influenced by Byzantine models, particularly the tradition of manuscript illumination which developed in connection with the text of the Heavenly Ladder, an ascetic monastic treatise written in the sixth century by John Climacus, Abbot of Mount Sinai.[1] The first manuscript with illuminations depicting the stages of the ascension motif which permeated this work has been dated in the tenth century.

---

[1] On the medieval iconographical tradition in connection with the personifications of the virtues and vices, cf. Künstle, Ikonographie, I, 156-67; Reau, Iconographie, I, 163ff.; and Sauer, Symbolik, 234ff. Cf. the important study by Mâle, Gothic Image, pp. 98-130.

[2] Cf. Mâle, Gothic Image, pp. 102f., 105f. in particular. The only extant ms. of the Hortus deliciarum was destroyed in the nineteenth century. The drawings had, however, been copied and were published by A. Straub and G. Keller, Herrade de Landsberg, Hortus Deliciarum. (Strassbourg, 1901). The "ladder of Charity" is found as pl. LVI; the "chariot of Lust," as pl. XLVII.

The virtue associated with each ladder in the four triads composing the pattern of ascension was personified by means of a small figure placed adjacent to the appropriate ladder. Likewise, the vices from which the ascents marked the escape were also depicted at the foot of the first ladder of each series. Hugh must have felt strongly that the position of the figures of the virtues might be misunderstood, for upon several occasions he cautioned that the virtues were to be placed next to and not on the ladders.[2] They were placed, as it were, between the ladders and the lines representing the floors of each level of the Ark. The practice closely resembles that of the illuminations in the Heavenly Ladder manuscripts and the Hortus deliciarum as well.[1]

---

[1] The question of direct or mediated influence cannot be resolved. Mâle, Gothic Image, p. 105, nn. 4f., indicates that Honorius of Autun conceived virtue as a ladder linking heaven and earth under the influence of St. John Climacus, while the Hortus deliciarum also was under Byzantine influence in representing the "ladder of charity." For a detailed discussion of the tradition of manuscript illumination associated with the texts of the Heavenly Ladder, cf. John Rupert Martin, The Illustration of the Heavenly Ladder of John Climacus ("Studies in Manuscript Illumination," 5; Princeton, 1954). Cited hereafter as Martin, Climacus. The relationship of the Hortus drawing to the Climacus tradition is discussed, ibid., p. 19.

[2] "Hoc autem, sicut diximus, observandum est, ut virtutes juxta scalas intrinsecus disponantur . . . ." A. myst., X, MPL 176:697C. Cf. A. myst., IX, MPL 176:696D: "Juxta scalas intrinsecus per campos disponuntur virtutes."

The virtues were so placed because the ladders were occupied already. Upon the one hundred and twenty steps of the ladders, ten steps to each ladder, stood sixty male and sixty female figures, placed alternately.[2] They were drawn "ascending to the cubit at the peak of the Ark, as if [ascending] to God."[3] The inspiration for this iconographic motif was taken from the Song of Songs. There Hugh found the mention of "sixty strong men who surrounded the litter of Solomon" and "sixty queens who ascended to the embrace of Solomon."[4]

Each figure depicting a virtue was drawn with the face of the individual looking upward toward the cubit. Hugh interpreted this tropologically, "so that nothing should be done for human praise."[5]

---

[1] The Climacus mss. illustrated in the pls. of Martin, Climacus, and the ladder of charity of the Hortus, ed. Straub and Keller, pl. LXV, have the virtues and vices represented almost without exception by means of figures placed adjacent to the ladders.

[2] A. myst., VII, MPL 176:692D, contains the primary reference. Elsewhere Hugh takes special care to point out that the ladders are occupied by the 120 figures so that the virtues must be placed next to the ladders; cf. A. myst., IX and X, MPL 176:696D and 697C. Again there is a parallel with the illustrations of the Climacus mss. and the Hortus. In the Climacus mss. generally one figure mounts the ladder; in the Hortus ladder several figures are shown falling from the ladder to temptations of vices while charity receives the crown of life.

[3] A. myst., VII, MPL 176:692D. [4] Song of Songs 3:7; 6:8.

[5] A. myst., IX, MPL 176:696D. Cf. ibid., VII and X, MPL 176:693AC and 697C.

What form did the figures for the virtues take? Briefly we should sketch the scenes intended by our victorine artist.

The first series of ladders, ascending the north-east corner of the ark and symbolizing the ascent from the cold of the east, marked the overcoming of pride.[1] By the first ladder a naked figure depicting fear (timor) could be seen ascending, with the "despicable clothing of pride" lying on the ground below, beside "fire and worms." This first figure was near to the book with the inscription, "Woe, Woe, Woe."[2] The second ladder showed sorrow (dolor), but Hugh gave no clue for the way in which sorrow should be depicted. His only remark was that the path of the transmigration to Babylon passed by the figure of sorrow. Near the third ladder stood love (amor), depicted in the form of one of the virgins "who, with a glowing lamp and a vase of oil, is expecting the coming of the bridegroom."[3]

---

1. Ibid., IX, 696C.

2. An allusion to the three woes of Rev. 9:12. On the book with the woes, cf. A. myst., VIII, MPL 176:696B. The book, which was shown extended downward by a hand from the column in the center of the Ark, symbolized one of the two functions of Christ as the Book of Life; He "chides the proud and enlightens the blind . . . ." A. morl., II, 9, MPL 176:641C, Sq., p. 84.

3. A. myst., IX, MPL 176:696C. With the parable of the wise and foolish virgins Hugh introduced an eschatological element. In medieval art, especially later in the thirteenth century, the virgins are found in the scenes of the Last Judgment. Cf. Mâle, Gothic Image, pp. 197ff. In A. myst., VII, MPL 176:693C the apocalyptic symbolism is made clearer. Hugh tells us that on the third ladder these words were inscribed: "Here ascend those longing for the fatherland, awaiting the return of the Bridegroom, and saying, 'Come, Lord Jesus Christ' (Rev. 20)."

The second series of three ascending ladders mounted upward from the southwest corner of the Ark. This was the ascension from the heat of the west and marked the flight from concupiscence.[1] At the base of the first ladder the figure of a nude woman was shown emerging from a cave. Nearby the "incentor vitiorum", probably in the form of a serpent or one of the demonic figures of medieval art, blew fire from mouth and nose, an indication of the burning lust of the flesh, i.e. concupiscence. The woman being tempted was, however, shaded by a branch which descended from the column in the center of the Ark. This branch conveyed the mystic meaning that Christ, Who is the "Tree of Life" set in the midst of the church, cools men's violent passions and desires.[2]

Alongside the three ladders of the ascent from concupiscence the three virtues were personified by actions indicating their character. Patience was shown as a young virgin being struck. A person in the act of distributing alms indicated mercy. Finally, compunction was depicted as a figure in the attitude of prayer, striking his chest.[3]

---

[1] A. myst., IX, MPL 176:696D. Cf. ibid., VII and X, 694AD and 697C.

[2] On the function of Christ as the "Tree of Life" cf. esp. A. morl., II, 9, MPL 176:641C: "He . . . feeds the hungry, gives shade to those oppressed with heat . . . . Let those inflamed with the fierce fire of vice seek shade to cool them. Let those who hunger and thirst after righteousness come hither quickly, that they may be filled."

[3] A. myst., IX, MPL 176:696D. Hugh has an important discussion of compunction, A. morl., III, 6, MPL 176:652Dff., Sq. pp. 103ff. Cassian influenced Hugh at this point; cf. Baron, Sci. et Sg., p. 170. Cf. Cassian, Conferences, ed. Pichery, III, 6, pp. 145f. for the "three-fold renunciation" which Hugh incorporated into his discussion of compunction, Sq. p. 104f.

The third group of ladders was set in the northwest corner of the Ark to signify the ascent from the cold of the west, i.e. from the state of ignorance.

The third ascent was made from the cold of the west to signify the return from ignorance. The ladders were set in the northwest corner of the Ark. In line with his established practice Hugh depicted ignorance near the base of the first ladder. Ignorance was personified by a figure emerging from a cave and was shown in the act of shattering a vase by striking it against a rock. This was intended to symbolize the fact that ignorance "dissipates the unity of the soul by varied errors."[1] The remedy for ignorance was the threefold ascent of knowledge, meditation, and contemplation.[2] Knowledge (cognitio) was personified by a figure standing near the first ladder and near the book which carried the inscription "In the beginning God created heaven and earth." (Gen 1:1) The rationale was straightforward: "The first knowledge of God is in creatures." Creation rightly considered leads to a knowledge of God which is the beginning of self-knowledge and a true estimate of the world and one's place in it. Near the second ladder meditation (meditatio) was portrayed by a seated individual who was gathering up the pieces of the vase which ignorance had broken. The third ladder, representing contemplation (contemplatio) was accompanied by the figure of a craftsman. He was in the process of melting down the fragments of the vase which meditation had gathered up. A band of color served to indicate that the 'liquefied' material of the vase was running into the cubit at the summit of the Ark, "as if running into a seal (moneta)."

---

[1] A. myst., IX, MPL 176:696D-697A.

[2] For the iconography of the three levels, cf. ibid., 697AB.

In connection with this third ascent Hugh offered an immediate interpretation of the "mystery" of the symbolism.

> The integrity of the soul, which ignorance breaks, understanding discovers, meditation gathers together, [and] contemplation, having liquefied it, transforms it by the fire of divine love, reforming it in the image [moneta] of the divine likeness.[1]

Here in a symbolic nutshell we have the whole theme of the Ark treatises. Indeed, we have the thematic current which runs through all of Hugh's writings: The destruction of the unity and the integrity of the human personality in the Fall and the gradual reintegration of this dissipated unity via the contemplative ascension. This theme runs through the Didascalicon[2] and De sacramentis christianae fidei[3] no less than it does through the treatises commonly designated as "mystical". The relation of this contemplative ascent to the decisive acts of God in history is a major element in the Ark treatises and forms the focus of the succeeding chapters of the present work.

---

[1] "Quia integritatem animae, quam ignorantia frangit, cognitio invenit, meditatio colligit, contemplatio per ignem divini amoris liquefaciendo in monetam divinae similitudinis reformandam fundit." A. myst., IX, MPL 176:697B. For a similar presentation of the themes of recollection, transformation, and unity cf. In Eccl. homil., I, MPL 175:116ff., Sq., pp. 187ff., where the symbolism of fire and smoke is eloquently employed.

[2] Cf., e.g. I, 1 and 5; II, 1 ("to restore within us the divine likeness"); and V, 9; Butt., pp. 4f., 12, 23f., 109ff.; Tay., pp. 46f., 51f., 61f., 132f. Cf. the comments of Taylor, p. 11.

[3] Cf. I, i, 12, MPL 176:195C-197B, Def., pp. 16-18. This is the mystical interpretation of the first three days of creation.

The fourth ascent, representing the ascent from the heat of the east and associated with the southeast, was made "in spiritual fervor."[1] As Hugh explained, this final ascent should not be understood as escape from vices. It was a progressive realization of ever greater virtue, "from the good to the better."[2]

Adjacent to the first ladder, temperance (temperantia) was personified as the head of a family (paterfamilia) seated at a table while eating and distributing alms. Such a person uses the world lawfully, serving the needs of his own body and attending to the wants of others. Near the second ladder prudence (prudentia) took the form of a stranger walking about, "like one who would flee the world." The third virtue, fortitude (fortitudo) was drawn so that a cloud covered the lower part of the body of the figure. Fortitude was likened to "one who has fled the world and who is being lifted upward, with hands reaching upward."[3]

These three descriptions of the virtues are very similar to the three levels of believers which Hugh distinguished within the Church. In the church there are three levels of believers: Those who use the world lawfully; those who flee the world; and those who have obliterated the memory of the world.[4]

---

[1] A. myst., VII, MPL 176:692D. [2] Ibid., 694D and 697CD.

[3] The description of the iconography of the three levels is found in ibid., 697BD and 694D. The cloud in the third level should probably be associated with the cloud Moses entered on Mount Sinai. Cf. infra on the biblical imagery associated with the fourth ascent.

[4] Cf. A. morl., I, 14, MPL 176:630B, Sq., p. 64. One may say of this what Danielou says of Origen's interpretation of the levels of the Ark: "The hierarchy of the Church is conceived not as an external priesthood but in accordance with its interior degrees of perfection." Shadows, p. 107. Hugh considered the ecclesiastical hierarchy at length, however, in De sacramentis, cf. II, iii, MPL 176:421B-434B, Def., pp. 259-73.

With this we complete the basic format of the twelve ladders which provided the framework of the ascension motif in the Ark treatises. We have not exhausted the iconography of the vessel, however. Note must be taken of the presence of the door and window of the Ark in the drawing and the correlation of the thirty biblical books with the thirty steps of each triad of ladders.

Along the side of the column representing the Book of Life, Hugh inscribed the titles of the thirty books of the Bible.[1] The books were evenly distributed with ten books to each level of the Ark. By skillful application of a verse or situation drawn from a selected book in each level Hugh indicated a biblical rationale for the characteristics of the ladders and the iconography. This was, to be sure, a rather mechanical correlation, but it accurately reflected a propensity to gather everything into a structured synthesis and to seek significant "indicators" to determine relationships.

It is unnecessary for the purpose of our discussion to go into this schematized use of biblical material. As examples of Hugh's method we cite the biblical basis for the iconography associated with the ascent from pride, the correlation of Genesis 1:1 with the first ladder in the ascent from ignorance, and the biblical symbolism connected with the three levels of the final ascension.

Next to the ladder representing the beginning for the ascent from pride Hugh wrote: "Their worm shall not die, their fire shall not be quenched."[1] The quote was from Isaiah 66:24, the final verse of the last book inscribed on the first level of the Ark. It provided the basis for the representation of fire and worms beside the "despicable clothing of pride" which lay at the foot of the ladder.

---

[1] A. morl., II, 11, MPL 176:642D, Sq., p. 87.

The first verse of Genesis was associated with the ascent from ignorance by knowledge, since Genesis was the first book in the first level of the Ark.[2] Hugh wrote by the side of this ladder: "Here ascend those who by reason of ignorance first received knowledge of God in creatures, Scripture teaching and sayings, 'In the beginning God made heaven and earth.'"[3]

In connection with the final triad of ladders Hugh abandoned the method of drawing upon portions of biblical books selected by "significant indicators" in the manner just noted. Instead he utilized three hierarchical triads drawn from biblical material. The first triad was composed of the reptiles, quadrupeds, and birds which occupied the Ark.[4] The second triad employed motifs drawn from the experience of the Israelites at Mount Sinai: The sons of Israel encamped eating and drinking and seeing the glory of God from afar; Aaron and the elders of the sons of Israel ascending the mountain; and Moses upon the summit of the mountain, alone in the cloud with the Lord.[1] The reptiles and the encamped Israelites represent the first level of the ascent, corresponding to those men who "use the world rightly." Reptiles, living in the water and in their compartments attached to the Ark, live in the church and in the world.[2] The quadrupeds and Aaron with the elders of the Israelites represent those who are forgetting and fleeing the world. The birds and Moses in the cloud upon the mountain represent those who have obliterated the world.[3] Thus the three stages of the last ascent, which moved from virtue to virtue were associated with significant triads drawn from the wealth of biblical imagery at Hugh's disposal.

---

[1] A. myst., VII, MPL 176:693A. For the drawing, cf. ibid., IX, 696C.

[2] Ibid., VII, 693C. [3] Ibid.

[4] A. myst., VII, MPL 176:692C and 695A. "At col. 692C the Migne text reads repentia, ambulantia, volantia. For "reptiles" and "birds" Hugh has used less common forms for the purpose of establishing a rhyming triad. This was in line with his general literary practice. Cf. Baron, Études, pp. 91ff. At col. 695A the common forms reptilia and volatilia are found. For the forms, cf. Blaise, Dictionnaire Latin-Francais des auteurs chrétiens (Turnhout, [1962]), ad verbum. For another use of animals in the Ark in connection with an hierarchical order, cf. A. morl., I, 15, MPL 176:631C-633A, Sq., pp. 67-69, dealing with the five-storied Ark.

---

[1] A. myst., MPL 176:695AB.

[2] The reptiles symbolize people who frequently sin, i.e. revert from the Ark into the flood. The "small chambers" attached to the Ark are the provisions made for the restoration of these persons through penance. Cf. ibid., XIII, 698D-699D, esp. 699C. Penitential discipline was a major aspect of the second series of ladders in the Ark. Cf. ibid., VII, 694AD.

[3] Moses in the cloud appears as a symbol of the highest knowledge of God in Ps.-Dionysius, Myst. Theol., I, 3, de Gandillac, p. 179. The theme derives from Philo, De Post., 12-13, from whom Clement of Alexandria and Gregory of Nyssa took it. Cf. Danielou, Shadows, p. 214f.: "This passage [from Philo] is the starting point of the whole idea of the via negativa of Mystical Theology." Cf. H.-Ch. Puech, "La Tenebre mystique chez le Pseudo-Denys," Études carmelitaines (1938), pp. 33ff.; Danielou Platonisme, pp. 207ff.; and Bouyer, La Spiritualité, pp. 48-56 and 355ff. Dionysius also mentions Moses' separation from the people and the approach with the elders, the latter signifying the highest knowledge through visible symbols.

In addition to the structural elements of the Ark already mentioned, Hugh also included the door and window set in the wall and roof of the Ark respectively.[1] These two elements offered an occasion for working out "a fresh and original treatment of the ascetic problem of the relation between action and contemplation . . . . symbolized by the difference between the position and the function of the door and the window in Hugh's Ark."[2] In addition to this, by grouping symbolic figures near the door Hugh was able to indicate the proper and improper "use" of the world by the ascetic.[3]

The window was drawn near the personification of compunction. From the window a hand extended with a dove.[4] The iconography connected with the door was more complex.[5] The complexity began with the fact that Hugh drew two doors in the picture. To justify this departure from the literal text, Hugh pointed out that we read of Christ "I am the Door." (Jn. 10:9) Consequently the door must be related to the column which symbolizes Christ. Since the column has been depicted in two 'halves' related to the "Tree of Li~~fe" and the~~ "Book of Life" we must expect two doors, one on the north, the other on the south side of the column.[1]

---

[1] Cf. A. myst., XI, MPL 176:697D-698C, for a description of the iconography involved. A. morl. discusses the place of the door and window in the Ark and the interpretation of these two elements; cf. I, 12, MPL 176:627AD, Sq., pp. 61f. for the structure and II, 3-7, 366B-339C, pp. 75-80, for the interpretation.

[2] Squires, SSW, p. 33.

[3] As Hugh points out in A. morl. IV, 17, MPL 176:675Dff.,Sq. pp. 144ff. the ascetic does not flee the world as such. The world, as created, is good. But it is the occasion for concupisence and must on that basis be avoided. Above all it is inner attitude which is essential, for it is the attitude one takes which makes things good or evil.

[4] A. myst., XI, MPL 176:698B. [5] Ibid., 697D-698C.

The north door, associated with the "Book of Life," signified the faith by which men enter the Church.[2] This entrance is made by means of the humility of the Incarnate Word who has come to recall men to God. The door was shown closed to indicate that there is "no return to ancient errors."

The south door was associated with the "Tree of Life."[3] This door signified the transition from this life to the future life, "i.e. the fruit of the Tree of Life," which meant for Hugh the contemplative visio Dei enjoyed by the saints in heaven. This door was open to indicate that the eye of the mind (occulis mentis) ought always to be "open."

The relationship between these doors and the window provided the basis for Hugh's treatment of the relation between the active and contemplative lives. The door, which was closed and opened only by God, symbolized the active life [actio, operatio] in which one ought to engage only by necessity. The window, which Noah could open, represented the continual possibility of "going forth" at will within the ascetic life from inward contemplation by means of contemplation [contemplatio, cogitatio] of the world.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., 697D-698A. [2] Ibid., 698A. [3] Ibid.

[4] Cf. A. morl., II, 3, MPL 176:637A, Sq., 75f., esp. p. 76: "For, although it is sometimes permissible to issue forth through thought, yet we must never go outside through work, save of necessity. This same thing is moreover fittingly conveyed by the fact that the man himself opened the window when he would, in order to send out the bird; but we read about the door that it was both shut from without by God, and reopened by Him, that the man might issue forth."

For Hugh the active life meant involvement with the world. There were four ways to leave the Ark and become involved in the world.[1] Only two were through necessity, however, They alone formed legitimate departures from the inner quiet of the contemplative life. Necessity was of two kinds: 1) The natural functions required for bodily existence, for Hugh had no unnatural ascetic tendencies which would cause him to abuse the body;[2] 2) the divine call to take part in the ecclesiastical structure by assuming leadership in the Church and thus responding to the spiritual needs of one's neighbors. The call to live in the world to serve the church may also be God's way of humbling the proud contemplative.[3] To experience the difficulty responding to external cares enjoined by duty while still longing for the inner peace of the life of contemplation can be a sobering experience. Aware of the difficulty, the once proud brother will have more respect for those who labor in the world.[4]

---

1. Ibid., 4, 637BC. Cf. also A. myst., XI, MPL 176:698BC.

2. "Hugh's necessitas, like Augustine's in similar contexts, explicitly includes that pressure of natural need to eat and take air and exercise which is common to all bodily existence . . . ." Squire, SSW, 34.

3. Hugh treats this idea at length in A. morl., III, 10, MPL 176: 655D-661B, Sq., pp. 108-17. Cf. Squire's remarks, SSW, pp. 34 and 37.

4. Hugh, like Gregory the Great, felt keenly the tension between legitimate and necessary concern for things in the world or in the Church and the equally imperative desire for the sweetness of inner peace flowing from the contemplative life. For Gregory's view, cf. Dudden, Gregory the Great, I, 225ff., and esp. the letter, written shortly after his elevation to the papacy, to Theoctista, the Emperor's sister, quoted ibid., 226f.: "I am tossed to and fro with the waves of business. . . . When my business is done I try to return to my innerself, but cannot, for I am driven away by vain tumultous thoughts. I loved the beauty of the contemplative life . . . . But by some judgment . . . I have been wedded . . . to the active life . . . ."

There were also two ways to leave the Ark in an unworthy manner: 1) Through the pursuit of the world's goods as ends in themselves, for the pleasure they yield; 2) Through the assumption of responsibility in the Church---or, better, the seeking of such responsibility---out of desire for glory and not from obedience to God's will.[1]

In imagery drawn from the Noachic narrative Hugh depicted these four ways of leaving the Ark through the door.[2] He paired the two attitudes toward the world and the two attitudes toward Church office. Those who use the world in accord with necessity are like the clean animals; those who seek the world inordinately are like unclean animals. The men who respond to God's call obediently, but with a sense of the loss of inner quiet, are like Noah who offered a sacrifice when leaving the Ark; those men who occupy ecclesiastical offices to glorify themselves while they also depise men of lower rank are like Ham, "who made mock of his father's nakedness, thus bringing down a curse upon himself."[3]

In the drawing of the Ark, two cattle were shown leaving the Ark to signal the departure of the clean animals, while two asses indicated the unclean.[4] Noah was shown exiting through a door held open by God.

---

[1] Cf. A. morl., I, 4, MPL 176:637BC, and A. myst., XI, MPL 176:698BC.

[2] Cf. A. myst., XI, MPL 176:698AC, and A. morl., II, 4, MPL 176:637BC, Sq., pp. 76f.

[3] A. morl., II, 4, MPL 176:637C, Sq., pp. 76f.

[4] A. myst., XI, MPL 176:698BC.

The good man thus responds to the divine call to leave the Ark of contemplation and to take a necessary responsibility in the world. The wicked man, Ham, was depicted leaving the Ark by shattering a closed door. His exit was one of disobedience to the divine will.

Hugh also spoke of four ways of going out of the Ark by means of contemplation (per cogitationem; per contemplationem) of the world.[1] Elsewhere Hugh called this contemplation fit for beginners, comparing it to the contemplation of the Creator, fit for the perfect.[2] There are three legitimate modes of contemplative consideration of the world, while the fourth mode is wrong.[3] The three accepted ways were symbolized by the dove, rising from the window. The fourth was symbolized by the raven, feeding upon a cadaver. The four ways of going out through the window were not developed in the iconography of the Ark drawing. Hugh treated them at some length in De arca Noe morali, however, and referred the reader of De arca Noe mystica to the earlier exposition of the theme.[4]

---

1. Cf. A. morl., I, 5, MPL 176:637C-638D, Sq., pp. 77-79. Cogitatio was contrasted with operatio by Hugh in ibid., I, 4, 637B, p. 76, while the passage in I, 5 contrasted contemplatio and actio. It was possible for Hugh to think of contemplatio as a specific aspect of cogitatio, cf. A. myst., X, MPL 176:697D where the third ascent in the Ark was called as ascent in cogitationibus; the third level of this ascent was contemplatio. The relationship will be considered infra in succeeding chapters.

2. Cf. In Eccl. homil., I, MPL 175:117B, Sq., p. 184.

3. The four ways of going out through consideration of the world are: 1) considering created things in themselves and finding all things are vanity; 2) considering creatures according to the gift of God and perceiving in them "the likeness of His mind;" 3) considering God's use of created things to fulfil His judgments; and 4) considering created things as satisfaction of our passions. Cf. A. morl., II, 5, MPL 176:637C-638D, Sq., pp. 77-79, and A. myst., XII, MPL 176:698CD.

4. Cf. refs. in n. 3, supra.

Hugh also drew a serpent writhing about the foot of the first ladder in each ascent.[1] The intention was directed toward symbolizing the treading underfoot of the vices. In the cold of the east, where man first fell, he begins his return by treading upon the head of the serpent (cf. Gen. 3:15), i.e. upon pride. The ascent from concupiscence treads upon the belly of the serpent, while the ascent from ignorance crushes the reptile's chest under foot. The final ascent in the heat of the east found the serpent folded up at the foot of the ladder. This use of a serpent at the foot of the ladders of ascent probably was derived, like the ladder motif itself, from sources going back to the tradition of illumination in the Climacus manuscripts discussed earlier.[2] Herrade of Landesberg also drew a serpent at the foot of her ladder of charity.[3]

Having presented the structure of the drawing which is centered on Noah's Ark, let us turn to certain questions which involve the purpose of the drawing and the relationship of the drawing to Hugh's exegetical practice. In particular, we shall be concerned with the exegesis of the Noachic material _ad litteram_ in Book I of _De arca Noe morali_.[4]

---

[1] Cf. _A. myst._, VIII, MPL 176:695D-696A, for the description of this motif.

[2] Cf. Martin, _Heavenly Ladder_, p. 15, where he notes the possible influence of imagery associated with the Last Judgment. Cf. _ibid._, fig. 66, for illus. in Climacus MS. On the serpent, cf. Mâle, _Gothic Image_, 378ff., where the origin of the symbol is found in the Leviathan of the Book of Job. Commentators took the serpent to represent Satan and his works.

[3] Cf. Straub and Keller, _Hortus deliciarum_, pl. LVI.

[4] Chs. 12f., MPL 176:626D-629D, Sq., pp. 60-63. The translation omits part of c. 13, 628C-629D. The allegorical interpretation follows immediately, chs. 14ff., MPL 176:629D-634C, Sq., pp. 64-72.

In two recent studies of Hugh's exegetical practice opposing positions have been put forward by Miss Beryl Smalley[1] and P. Henri de Lubac.[2]

Miss Smalley has taken the Ark treatises to be superlative examples of Hugh's concern to elucidate the letter of scripture with the ultimate purpose of visualizing concretely the persons, places, and things described in the biblical record. The drawing of the Ark of Noah was Hugh's attempt to realize the actual form of the historical Ark of Noah. Miss Smalley's point of view is summed up in the following quotation:

> The treatise therefore began with two pictures: Christ in majesty and a Noe's ark. Hugh is in such sympathy with his audience that we share their gratitude when these tangible forms appear. He keeps referring to himself as the artist . . . . In the accompanying treatise, the De Arca Noe Mystica, he describes himself drawing . . . . He explains the complicated symbolism of the cubit and its colours and then draws a diagram, carefully explaining how it represents the ark.
>
> Oh yes! we think of the Kindergarten. We smile when Hugh, with the gravity of one in the forefront of a scientific movement, rejects Origen's figure of the ark as top-heavy, and when he proposes 'little compartments', round the outside, for the amphibious beasts. Our smile is mistaken: a scientific movement is really afoot. Hugh is doing, for biblical history, what St. Anselm of Bec and Master Anselm had done for theology in their different ways. He is making the letter a proper subject for study, as they had made the content of the Christian faith. He wants to understand the literal meaning of Scripture exactly, so as to visualize the scene.[3]

---

[1] SBMA, pp. 83-106. [2] EM, II, i, 287-359 [3] SBMA, pp. 96f.

The sketch of the Ark was an artistic statement of Hugh's emphasis upon the primacy of the literal reading of scripture. The Didascalicon and the treatise De scripturis bore fruit not only in biblical commentaries, but in the drawing of the Ark, according to Miss Smalley.

This position has been criticized by de Lubac in his comprehensive analysis of patristic and medieval exegetical practice.[1] De Lubac's major contention is that Hugh was not an innovator but rather a faithful follower of the traditional exegetical pattern instituted by Gregory the Great, with roots in the more ancient tradition reaching to Origen.[2] De Lubac will not admit that Hugh introduced a new valorization of the historical sense of scripture. History seems to take on more value only because Hugh was the first to introduce a program of biblical studies based upon the three senses of scripture.[3] He did not alter the valence given to either letter or spirit in the tradition. He introduced a more structured approach, in order to conserve the tradition, not in order to alter it.

---

1. EM, II, i, 287-359, cf. esp. pp. 317-28 on the Ark.

2. "His [Hugh's] systematic thought as well as its practical effect are in great part simply traditional. Such is the conclusion which arises after an attentive reading of his writings, especially the major methodological texts, the Didascalicon and De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris." EM, I, i, 288. Throughout the chapter on Hugh, de Lubac constantly cites the traditional nature of many of Hugh's ideas; cf. in particular the important section, pp. 328-39, "Hugues et saint Gregorie."

3. Ibid., p. 318. The development of a clearer distinction between "letter" and "spirit", which Miss Smalley views as an innovation (SBMA, p. 230), is for de Lubac the result of an attempt to preserve the traditional doctrine of the senses of Scripture.

To counter Miss Smalley's assertion of Hugh's innovative capacity in the field of biblical exegesis de Lubac utilizes the drawing of the Ark. Quite rightly he points out that the drawing which Hugh described was not a representation of the structure of the Ark as determined in Hugh's exegesis "according to the truth of the letter."[1] In supposing this Miss Smalley has been misled.

De Lubac considers Hugh's aim in the Ark treatises to have been oriented totally toward symbolism. "Everything, absolutely everything, was governed by a symbolic intention."[2] The five-storied Ark found its way into Hugh's exegesis for one basic reason: Hugh wanted to utilize the five-storied construct in his allegorical interpretation of the Ark material.

The question of Hugh's intention in the treatises on Noah's Ark is not solved as easily as de Lubac would have us believe. Miss Smalley has accurately sensed a revived interest in the literal exegesis of scripture at St. Victor, and she has properly noted that this revival was initiated by Hugh of St. Victor. Furthermore, it must be admitted that Hugh was doing more than repeating the tradition. He was engaged in a new emphasis upon the literal sense of scripture as the Didascalicon and De scripturis make so clear.[3]

---

[1] "He bestowed meticulous care on his drawing. But this care was not expended to describe the historical ark from the point of view of a scientific description . . . from beginning to end De arca Noe mystica is a vast symbolic tableau." EM, II, i, 324f.

[2] Ibid., p. 325.

[3] Cf. our preceeding chapter and the treatment of Hugh's exegesis there, and also Chenu, TDS, pp. 62-89 and 200-209.

Unfortunately, Miss Smalley's analysis of Hugh's drawing of the Ark was defective. The plain fact of the matter is that Hugh did not base his drawing upon the conclusions he reached in his literal exegesis. The drawing presented a three-storied Ark. Hugh's literal exegesis yielded a five-storied vessel. But neither will de Lubac's insistence stand. Hugh's aim was not "purely symbolic."

An analysis of the literal exegesis carried out in Book I of De arca Noe morali will show the strengths and weaknesses of these two opposed evaluations of the Ark treatises. Both are based upon an inadequate appreciation of the material.

In opening his consideration of the Ark, Hugh noted:

> Those who want to make a closer study of the truth of what is told us about Noah's Ark according to the letter have to search out two things in particular--namely, its shape and its size.[1]

Hugh's comments thereafter show that he had read his predecessors on the subject of the Ark. He spoke repeatedly of "the learned" and "authority."[2] The points of view were critically weighed. Just as in De sacramentis christianae fidei, however, Hugh tended to cite authorities without specific references.

---

[1] A. morl., I, 12, MPL 176:626D, Sq., p. 60.

[2] "Now Origen with reference to the shape says . . . ." "For the learned tell us that . . . ." "The learned answer the objections on these lines . . . ." A. morl., I, 12f., MPL 176:626D, 627C, 628A, Sq., pp. 60-62. For a summary of the patristic and medieval ideas concerning the shape of the Ark, cf. Dom Cameron Allen, The Legend of Noah. Renaissance Rationalism in Art, Science, and Letters (Urbana, Ill., 1963), pp. 71f. Cited hereafter as Allen, Noah.

After carefully evaluating Biblical and patristic evidence Hugh concluded that the Ark was a vessel with five stories.[1] The superstructure looked like a house with a longitudinal roof-line. The vertical walls of the house enclosed the three lower stories of the Ark while the two upper stories were located within the roof-space. The roof met at the top in a ridge one cubit in width extending the length of the Ark. In one of the walls a door was placed. In the roof there was a single window. Without any doubt we may conclude that Hugh conceived the

---

[1] For Hugh's description of the shape of the Ark, cf. A. morl., I, 12, MPL 176:627AD, Sq. pp. 61ff.

Ark in the form of a long house set upon a standard ship's hull. Generally speaking, this represented a new position.[1] There are adumbrations of such a structure in Christian art before the tenth century.[2] In the twelfth century the house-on-a-hull Ark became very popular.[1] Hugh may have been tributary to an emerging revision in iconographical practice, but there is the possibility that the Victorine cannon may have been instrumental in formulating a new conception of the Ark.[2]

---

[1] The iconographic tradition had generally depicted the Ark without much concern for the factor of seaworthiness: "The Ark had never, as far as we know, been understood and reproduced with an intention to be 'historical'; its form, consequently, was subjected to all sorts of imaginary conceptions." *DACL*, I, ii, 2711. For the Ark in Christian art cf. summaries in *DACL*, I, ii, 2709-2731, and Allen, Noah, pp. 155-73. The Ark was one of the earliest and most popular subjects in frescoes and on saracophagi. It was represented as a chest or saracophagus with the lid open and Noah standing in the box with his arms raised in prayer. The emphasis was on the deliverance of Noah as a foreshadowing of deliverance from death. On the iconography cf. *DACL*, I, ii, 2709 ff., and W. Lowrie, *Art in the Early Church* (New York, 1947). Lowrie, p. 84f., says: "[The Ark was] merely a cubical box, having a lid and a lock. The Christian artists did not invent this form: The word "box" was used in the Septuagint, and precisely such a box as we see in the catacombs was used in classic art to tell the story of Danäe and Perseus set adrift in the sea, or of Deucalion and Pyrrha in the Greek myth of the flood." (For Danäe and Perseus in a box, cf. *DACL*, I, ii, fig. 925.) Two important illustrations of the Ark appear in early illuminated biblical MSS: The Vienna Genesis (5th cent.) and the Ashburnham Pentateuch (7th cent.). The Vienna Genesis showed the Ark as a step-pyramid with three levels. Cf. the summary of critical study of the MS. in E. Wellesz, *The Vienna Genesis*(New York, 1960), with pl. of Ark in flood-waters, p. 23. Important studies are: E. R. von Hartel und F. Wickhoff, *Die Wiener Genesis* (Wien, 1895) and Hans Gerstinger, *Die Wiener Genesis* (Wien, 1931). For a general summary of the MS., cf. *DACL*, VI, i, 927-35. On the Ashburnham Pentateuch, cf. *DACL*, I, ii, 2971-2974, with refs. there, and the pl. opp. cols. 2971f. The Ashburnham Pentateuch showed the Ark in the form of a chest with four feet and a hinged lid.

[2] Cf. the refs. in Allen, *Noah*, pp. 157f. The typological relationship of the Ark to the Church and the cross found symbolic presentation by means of a mast with a yardarm, clearly indicative of the cross, and a superstructure shaped like a church. A perfect example comes from the twelfth-century; cf. A. Boeckler, *Die Regensburg-Prüfeiniger Buchmalerei . . . .*, Taf. XXVII, Abb., 31, and text pp. 35ff. The inscription around the illumination depicting the Ark with mast, yardarm, and basilica superstructure makes the identification with cross and church explicit; cf. p. 37 for German trans. of inscription. Allen, *Noah*, pp. 157 points out that such elements can be found in 7th and 10th century materials. On the typological parallel between the wood of the Ark and the wood of the Cross, cf. H. Rahner, "Das Schiff aus Holz," *ZKT*, LXVII (1943), 1-21, cited in his *Greek Myths and Christian Mystery* (New York, 1963), p. 61, n. 2.

At this point there is no doubt that Hugh was seeking to visualize the Ark, as Miss Smalley has pointed out. He freshly critiqued biblical evidence with an eye on traditional interpretations and concrete possibilities. Hugh's attitude toward Origen's opinion concerning the shape of the Ark reveals this critical spirit.[3] The Alexandrian exegete had proposed an Ark with sides which sloped inward as they rose from a quadrilateral base until they converged to a separation of one cubit square. The early medieval commentary tradition followed Origen at this point.[4]

---

[1] Cf. the cases cited in Allen, Noah, pp. 159ff. Among the instances, we note the facades of the cathedrals of Nimes and Lincoln; the frescoes in St. Savin-Sur-Gartempe at Vienna; and the mosaics in the nave of Monreale Cathedral. The mosaics in St. Mark's, Venice, are not to the point, for there the Ark is a rectangular "box" floating directly on the waves. For citations of thirteenth-century examples, which embrace both house and pyramid Arks, cf. Allen, Noah, p. 161, n. 91.

[2] Allen embraces both opinions; cf. ibid., pp. 72 and 157.

[3] A. morl., I, 12, MPL 176:626D-627A; Sq., pp. 60f. Origen's opinion found in In Genesim homilia, XII, MPG 12:162. De Lubac dismisses the difference between Origen and Hugh by saying: "Finally each one of them gave the Ark a form equally material and 'historically' precise."EM, I, ii, 321. This glosses over the real contribution which Hugh made.

[4] Cf. de Lubac, EM, I[illegible] i, 321, has given a convenient resumé of the manner in which the medieval tradition followed Origen on the shape of the Ark. Cf. Allen, Noah, p. 71: "All of the earlier writers thought of it as pyramidal in shape." According to Allen, Hugh of St. Victor was the first man to break with this view in the commentary tradition. This leaves aside the question of developments in art.

Hugh rejected Origen's model of the Ark because he was convinced that Origen's vessel would not float. In the first place Hugh argued that the structure would not distribute the weight properly. It would be top-heavy. For proof, Hugh invited his readers to observe contemporary twelfth-century shipbuilding practices: "This fact we can put to the proof today with ships that carry heavy loads."[1] In the second place, Hugh noted that sides which sloped inward as they rose would not "throw back" the waves. Instead they would be pushed down by the waves. "How was it that the whole thing did not forthwith sink to the bottom?"[2] In arguing against the structure proposed by Origen, Hugh carefully brought contemporary evidence to bear critically upon the tradition.

In addition to the shape, Hugh considered the size of the Ark.[3] In dealing with the capacity of the Ark to carry the necessary animals and foodstuffs Hugh made no contribution. He repeated the comments of Augustine.[4] Augustine in turn cited Origen's arguments with approval.[5]

If we recall the shape of the Ark which Hugh described in De arca Noe mystica, it should be apparent that the drawing was not based upon the conclusions of the literal interpretation of the shape of the Ark.

---

1. A. morl., I, 12, MPL 176:627A, Sq. p. 60.

2. A. morl., II, 12, MPL 176:626B, Sq., p. 61.

3. Ibid., 13, 628A-629C.

4. De civitate Dei, XV, 27, and Quaest. in Hept., I, 4.

5. For Origen's comments, cf. In Genesim homilia, XII, MPG 12:166-67.

Hugh's exegesis had yielded an Ark with five stories, vertical walls, and a roof with a ridge-line one cubit in width stretching the length of the Ark. The drawing of the Ark had as a base a normal ship's hull, we may assume, but from that point on it agreed in no particulars with the literal exegesis. The drawing had three stories, with four sloping walls which came together at the peak with a separation of one square cubit. A central column supported this superstructure.

Hugh did not leave his readers without an explanation for this change. Basically, it was motivated by what we may call "iconographical necessity." Hugh put it simply: "We have depicted this form [the three-storied Ark] in preference to the other, because we were unable to show the height of the walls in a flat drawing."[1] Viewed from above the three stories enclosed by vertical walls would have been precisely superimposed. On the other hand, an ark with sloping sides made it possible to indicate the differences between the individual levels while depicting the Ark from above. A top view was the only possible way of representing the longitudinal and latitudinal aspects of the Ark's structure in a simple, undistorted drawing.

Since Hugh's purpose in drawing the figure of the Ark was instruction via allegory and tropology, a drawing which left three of the five stories essentially concealed would have been useless. The aim of the drawing was instruction, not reconstruction. "Thus you may learn from an external form, which we have visibly depicted, what you ought to do interiorly . . . ."[1] Hugh turned to the truncated pyramidal form of the Ark superstructure because it answered his need for an adequate vehicle for his spiritual exegesis. Had the five-storied Ark provided an adequate iconographic vehicle one may assume he would have utilized it.[2]

---

[1] A. morl., I, 13, MPL 176:629D.

It is important to note the significance of the inclusion of the literal exegesis which developed the five-storied form of the Ark. Such an action on Hugh's part offers clear support to any claim for Victorine seriousness about the letter of Scripture. We have seen de Lubac's charge that Hugh's five-storied Ark was the result of a conscious attempt to provide an Ark which would be of especial use in allegory. However, it is important to ask why Hugh proposed a five-storied Ark if his whole aim was symbolic. The central "symbol" in the Ark treatises was a three-storied Ark, not one with five stories.

---

[1] Ibid., 7, 622C, p. 52.

[2] Hugh did expound the five-storied Ark allegorically, cf. ibid., 15 and 16, 631C-633C, pp. 67-70. This form of the Ark offered one distinct advantage when expounding his teaching on the contemplative life. The vertical walls and the sloping roof provided a locus for presenting the contrast between the contemplative experience in this life, in which man never experiences the visio Dei, and the contemplative experience in heaven, where God is seen "face to face." "In this life, we are nevertheless in some sense still turned away from our Creator's face . . . . we are still not bent in towards Him by immediate vision." Ibid., 15, 631D-632A, p. 68.

As for the presence of an allegorical interpretation of the five stories of the Ark, we should be more surprised if Hugh had failed to elicit the spiritual meaning of the structure which he proposed. If the foundation of history needed to be laid with care, no less did the superstructure of allegory need expert craftsmanship. Hugh took the opportunity in the first Ark treatise to apply his sensitive talent for spiritual exegesis to the five-storied structure. It is not difficult to sense the appreciation which Hugh's readers must have felt in the presence of his precise and persuasive elucidation of the spiritual meaning of the five-storied Ark. It was a sensitive exposition, keyed to some of the prime elements of Victorine spirituality.

The appearance of literal exegesis at variance with the drawing should be seen as a mark of the honesty with which Hugh pursued the results of careful and considered exegesis. He was following his own advice to lay firmly the foundation of the letter. This he did with singular purpose, although for technical reasons the results of this endeavor were set aside. Obviously Hugh was in favor of letting his students know what the literal text yielded. A less honest exegete might have ignored the "truth of the letter" pointing to a five-storied Ark while blithely drawing the three-storied Ark. Hugh faithfully presented the "truth of the letter" and explained why it was impossible to follow it in the drawing.

Hugh took the claim of the letter of scripture seriously in the first treatise on the Ark. That his effort bore no fruit in the remainder of that work and the second treatise on the Ark ought not to blind us to the results which he attained. Only by appreciating the exegesis in its setting can it be evaluated fairly. Miss Smalley and H. de Lubac have both erred in excess for they have failed to consider the total context and use of the Ark material. Our hope is that some balance has been attained in this present exposition and that the essential and valuable points of previous analyses have been retained.

To conclude this consideration of the drawing which accompanied Hugh's reflections upon the Ark of Noah it is appropriate to turn to the question of the inclusion of the figure of Christ in the drawing. Also, it is pertinent to seek the rationale for identifying the figure of Christ with the vision of Isaiah rather than with some other scripture passage of christological significance.

The function of the figure of Christ within the overall context of the drawing should be clear from the preceeding analysis. The figure of Christ served as a symbolic "environment" in which the Ark, the mappa mundi and the rest of the machina universitatis were placed. Thus, the single figure served to focus attention upon the confluence of several Christological functions: Creation, Providence, Judgment, and Object of Contemplation.

In the section of De arca Noe morali in which Hugh interpreted the meaning of the vision of Isaiah, the whole presentation of the material moved toward a climax in which the figures of the Ark and Christ were bound together through mutual identification with the Church.[1]

---

[1] Cf. I, 10, MPL 175:625CD, Sq., p. 58. "The head and the feet are covered, therefore, because we cannot discover either the first things or the last. The body is visible, because we see the intermediate things that happen in the present age. This body is the Church, which began when the world began, and will last till the end of the age. This is the ark, of which we have set out to speak; and it reaches from the head to the feet, because through successive generations Holy Church reaches from the beginning to the end."

The Church is the Body of Christ.[1] Likewise, the Ark is a type of the Church. The Church, the dynamic community of faithful men stretching across the scale of time from Creation to Consummation, forms the living--and mystic--link between the figures of Christ and the Ark.

In identifying the Lord of Isaiah's vision with Christ in glory Hugh followed ancient tradition. Jerome had made the identification and the _Glossa_ on Isaiah 6 followed Jerome.[2] Earlier than Jerome, Origen had followed a different tack, finding a foreshadowing of Christ and the Holy Spirit in the seraphs who veil the head and feet of the Lord, Who is, for Origen, God.[3] Hugh clearly followed the interpretation offered by Jerome in giving the Christological emphasis.

There is a further reason for the inclusion of the figure of Christ and for the association of the figure with the passage from Isaiah. The allegorical exegesis of the vision furnished the locus in which to introduce with great effect the question of the relationship between the Creator and His creation, between time and eternity, between that which is ever-changing and that which is ever-the-same. Hugh began here with the patristic tradition. The final statement reflected his own innovations.

---

[1] On the Church as the Body of Christ, cf. Mersch, _The Theology of the Mystical Body_, trans. C. Vollert (St. Louis, 1952).

[2] Jerome, _Comm. in Is. proph._, III, MPL 24:94BC. The _Glossa ord._ quotes Jerome, without citing by name, in interpreting the text, _Vidi Dominum_, MPL 113:1243A.

[3] Cf. Origen, _Hom. in Is._, I, 2 _GCS_, VIII, p 244. Cf. Crouzel, _Conaissance myst._, p. 81: "The two seraphs (the Son and the Spirit) hide not only, as in _Peri Archon_ (II, 11, 4-7) the beginning and end of the universe, but also the mystery of God." On _Peri Archon_, cf. _ibid._, p. 49. For earlier interpretations of the theme, cf. Danielou, _Theol. jud. chr._, I, 185-92.

Jerome, and also Origen, interpreted the veiling of the Lord's head and feet by the seraphs as an indication of His eternity.[1] Jerome went on to add that the visible body of the Lord was a symbol of "those things which were made in six days." By this, he meant the whole of the created order. Hugh began with this patristic background and then moved forward to develop his own interpretation of allegorical meaning of the visible body of Christ. It was an interpretation clearly reflecting Victorine consciousness of history. As elsewhere in Hugh's writings, allegory was employed here for the vigorous assertion of the fundamental role of historical consciousness in the Christian religion.

The visible body of Christ, Hugh observed, was "the period of time between the beginning and the end [of the world]."[2] Jerome's emphasis upon the static order of the world gave way to the Victorine conception of the dynamic nature of the history of the Church in transit between the Creation and the Consummation of all things.

---

[1] Cf. supra, p. 188, nn. 2f.

[2] A. morl., I, 10, MPL 176:625C.

This shift of emphasis was of no small importance. It enabled Hugh to introduce, by means of the vision, the problem of the relationship of time and eternity and to set this tension in a context which was Christological and ecclesiological, and accompanied with contemplative ramifications.[1]

It has been observed that the main metaphysical problem for Augustine "always is the relation of what is ceaselessly becoming 'other' in time to what remains immutable the same in eternity".[2] The same theme runs through the treatises on the Ark from beginning to end. In the treatises the fact that the Ark floats upon the stormy waters of the flood becomes a central concern.

Man's quest, as Hugh viewed it, was a constant search for an "Ark" capable of offering a refuge of stability. This was a repeated theme of the treatises. As Squire has said:

> The . . . treatises on the theme of the Ark are concerned . . . primarily with the [fact that the Ark] will float upon the moving flux of time. . . . Hugh is concerned to establish a point of view from which the passage of time, and the storms and toils of events, can be regarded with tranquillity.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Leclercq, et al, La spiritualité, p. 285: "Hugh's theological conceptions are strongly christocentric, ecclesiological, and sacramental, in opposition to what one finds with the scholastics of the schools and universities, preoccupied by problems of metaphysics, anthropology, psychology, and ethics." It is notable, however, that Hugh forged something of a synthesis of the two points of view. Without sacrificing the former point of view, he interested himself in the problems of the "scholastics" as well. De sacramentis christianae fidei and its influence stand as witness to the common interests and to the uniqueness of Hugh's approach. The Ark treatises, especially the first, also offer important insights in the areas denominated "scholastic" above. The controlling ethos was, however, opposed to that of the schools.

[2] Gilson, History, p. 71. For his longer treatment of the theme cf. Augustine, pp. 189ff.

[3] SSW, p. 33.

This Victorine concern, firmly grounded in the Augustine's earlier quest, will be of primary interest as we turn to consider the confluence of the consciousness of history with the desire for contemplative union as expressed in the treatises on the Ark.

CHAPTER III

The Theological Setting for the Contemplative Life

Before exploring the interaction of the Victorine consciousness of history with the aspirations of contemplative desire we must pause to take account of the controlling principles which informed Hugh of St. Victor's theological stance. In the course of this interlude we shall be concerned with the major areas of his thought insofar as they impinge upon the train of thought which emerged in the Ark treatises. This means that we shall be concerned above all with Hugh's anthropology, his seminal idea of the "two works"--the work of creation(*opus conditionis*) and the work of restoration (*opus restaurationis*)--which compose the totality of divine activity, his doctrine of God, his understanding of the world, and his sacramental and Incarnational thought. We do not propose to offer an exhaustive analysis of Hugh's theology at this point. There are numerous monographs and several recent books which contribute to this.[1] There yet remains much work to be done, for as Schlette has pointed out, some of the work has been vitiated by a too-facile application of Thomistic categories, particularly the distinction of nature and supernature, to the Victorine material.[1]

---

[1] Cf. the exhaustive bibliography in Baron, *Sci. et Sg.*, esp. pp. 251-57, and his citation of selected monographs, p. 97, n. 1. Of recent studies, cf. esp. Lasić, *Théologia perfectiva*; Schlette, *Nichtigkeit*, and "Die Eucharistielehre . . . ," *ZKT*, LXXXI (1959), 67ff., 163ff.; Baron, *Études*; and van den Eynde, *Essai*, in addition to Baron, *Sci. et Sg.*

The general framework in which Hugh articulated his theological position was governed by principles which the middle ages inherited from Augustine of Hippo.[2] It was not for nought that Hugh was called alter Augustinus. This Augustinian base meant that Hugh took his starting point from a world-view which was greatly informed by the Platonic and Neoplatonic assumptions which Augustine had espoused.[3]

The Platonic orientation which Hugh derived from Augustine emerged very clearly in the Victorine's strong sense of the radical dichotomy between the two worlds of material and spiritual reality. "Let us understand," Hugh told his readers, "that there are two worlds, the seen and the unseen . . . ."[4] On the one hand there was the visible, material world of which man was aware through his bodily senses. On the other hand, there was the invisible world of spiritual realities and verities. Throughout all of his writings Hugh reflected this basic Augustinian tension between the "two worlds."

---

[1] Nichtigkeit, p. 24, n. 5, where Schlette criticizes Lasic, Théologia perfectiva, on these grounds. The older work of Mignon also suffered from a rigid application of Thomistic categories and an enthusiasm to show Hugh in accord with Aquinas at all points. The basic Victorine position and its opposition to Thomistic categories of nature / grace and nature/supernature has been explicated in H. Köster, Die Heilslehre des Hugo von St. Viktor (Emsdetten, 1940).

[2] On the influence of Augustine, cf. Gilson, Spirit, and Augustine; Portalie, E., "Augustinisme (Developpement historique de l')," DTC, I, i, 2501-62; De Wulf, History, I, 93f; and Ueberweg-Geyer, Grundriss, II, 149.

[3] For an excellent summary of Platonic influences as they reached the twelfth-century, cf. Chenu, TDS, chaps. V-VIII, esp. pp. 108-41. Chenu clearly distinguishes the various types of "platonism" represented by Augustine, Dionysius, Boethius, the Timaeus, and Arabian sources.

[4] A. morl., IV, 12, MPL 176:672D.

Hugh distinguished these two worlds by means of several pairs of terms: visible/invisible, corporeal/spiritual, and transitory/eternal, for example.[1] In line with his Augustinian tendency to interiorize the realm of spiritual reality Hugh also contrasted the two worlds as exterior/interior or as "this whole scheme of things which we see with our bodily eyes . . . ," over against the world within the heart of man, "which we cannot see."[2]

Hugh's anthropology clearly reflected the platonizing influences at work in his theological stance. Man was seen as the union, or at least the joining together, of two substances. Man was composed of a material body and a spiritual soul. Like Augustine, Hugh faced the problem of defining the precise nature of the relationship between these two diametrically opposed substances. Like Augustine again, Hugh never succeeded in giving a clear solution to the problem.[3]

In defining the nature of man, Hugh attempted to maintain that man was one being in whom body and soul were united. When in the Incarnation Christ took human nature, he took "flesh . . . and a rational soul . . . ."[4] You do not have human nature unless you have both body and soul. Nevertheless, Hugh also tended to define man solely in terms of one side of the body-soul equation: The soul. Being pure spirit, the soul is the superior part of the human personality. Hugh could say: "The soul, which is the better part of man, or rather was man himself . . . ."[1] Or again, "What is man but the soul?"[2] Like most medieval men, Hugh also accepted the famous definition of Boethius, that "person is the individual element of rational substance."[3] Since rational substance is to be identified with soul alone, again we have a definition which places the essence of man in the soul.

---

[1] Cf., e.g., DS, I, vi, 6, MPL 176:267B, Def., p. 98.

[2] A. morl., IV, 12, MPL 176:672D.

[3] For Augustine's anthropology, cf. Gilson, Augustine, pp. 44-55.

[4] DS, II, i, 6, MPL 176:383B, Def., p. 218. Cf. Ibid., chap. 11, 403Aff., pp. 240ff.

In describing the joining of body and soul in the human personality, Hugh used terms which indicated the essential dissimilarity of the two elements being so associated. He spoke of the association of body and soul in such terms as: _Confoederatio_, _amicitia_, _consortium_, and _sociare_.[4] These terms point not to a clearly articulated, carefully reasoned anthropology. They rather indicate that Hugh was assuming the Augustinian-Platonic anthropology with its sharp differentiation of matter and spirit and its affirmation of the conjunction of the two in human nature.[5] The human personality was formed not by composition but by the apposition of body and soul.[6]

---

[1] _Ibid._, I, vi, 2, 264C, p. 95.

[2] _Ibid._, II, i, 11, 407D, Def., p. 245. J. Kleinz, _The Theory of Knowledge of Hugh of St. Victor_ (Washington, D.C., 1944), p. 22, n. 18.

[3] _Ibid._, 406A, p. 243. Cf. _DSSS_, XIV, MPL 175:21C. Cf. Boethius, _De person. et duab. nat._, c. 3, MPL 64:1343C, for the source.

[4] Cited by Schlette, _Nichtigkeit_, p. 57.

[5] Cf. _Ibid._, pp. 55ff.

[6] Cf. Ueberweg-Geyer, _Grundriss_, II, 266, citing _DS_, II, i, 11, MPL 176:409BC, Def., p. 246.

For Hugh, the union of body and soul in man finally became less of a metaphysical problem and more of a significant symbol of divine truth to be apprehended by man. The union of body and soul, which remained enigmatic, nevertheless demonstrated the power and grace of God. Man was intended to perceive

> that if God could join such different natures as body and soul in one union (foederationem) and friendship (amicitiam), by no means would it be impossible for Him to elevate the lowness of the rational creature, although far inferior, to participation in His own glory.[1]

Hugh's bent toward symbolism and his keen sense of the mystery of God's grace obviously displaced theological reflection at this point.

It is, however, important to point out that in his consideration of the relationship of the body to the soul, Hugh never entered into the typical Platonic denigration of the body and the material world. There was no hint of the Platonic idea that, after all, the body is simply the "tomb" of the soul.[2] Neither was there in Hugh's thought the idea that the soul was a divine "spark" entrapped in the gross matter of the physical body in the midst of a fallen world, an idea which the early Gnostics maintained.[3] Nor did Hugh consider the body an encumbrance of the pure soul, as did Plotinus.[1]

---

[1] DS, I, vi, 1, MPL 176:263D, Def., p. 94.

[2] Cf., e.g., Plato, Cratylos, 400c, and Gorgias, 493a. Cited by Schlette, Nichtigkeit, p. 46, n. 4.

[3] Schlette, Nichtigkeit, p. 46. On Gnosticism, W. C. Van Unnik, Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings, trans. Hubert Hoskins ("Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 41), and H. Jonas, The Gnostic Religion. The Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity (2nd ed. rev.; Boston, 1963).

The position of our Victorine canon, and that of Augustine likewise, was to affirm that the joining of body and soul in the human person was the deliberate act of the triune God in the creation of the universe. Like the rest of His creative acts, this also was good.

> Therefore, God confirmed His power and showed His grace, first by fashioning man.
>
> . . . .
>
> Thus, God made man of a two fold substance, taking his body according to matter from the earth, but fashioning his soul without matter from nothing.[2]

The union of matter and spirit in man was not the result of a Fall. The Fall played a dominant role in the theology of Hugh of St. Victor; indeed his theology is incomprehensible without a clear understanding of his ideas on this point, but temporal and material existence were part of human experience before the Fall.

This association of body and soul in the unity of the human person made of man a creature unique in the universe. This uniqueness stemmed from man's position in the ontological structure of the universe which formed the basis of Hugh's metaphysic. In its simplest form, the order of the universe was found in the dichotomy of spiritual and material substances and the supremacy of spirit to matter. The order was expanded to include three elements: God--rational spirit--the world.[1] In this order the echo of Augustine is very clear.[2]

---

[1] Cf. E. Brehier, *The Philosophy of Plotinus*, trans. Joseph Thomas (Chicago, 1958), p. 33, quoting Plotinus, *Enneads*, iv, 8. 3. Kleinz, *Theory of Knowledge*, p. 22, surely exaggerates when he says Hugh considered the body "an appendage which does not enter into the essential definition of the human person."

[2] *DS*, I, vi, 1, MPL 176:264C, Def., p. 95.

In this ordered universe, God was at all points absolutely other than His creation.[3] The creation consists of rational spirit, which means angels and human souls, and the material world.[4] Man thus exists at the interface of the major division in the ontological structure of the created world. Possessing a body, man moved in the world of material objects and was part and parcel of this sphere of existence. But man also possessed a soul which is a part of the spiritual sphere, the world of rational spirits. In his person, then, man unites, or rather associates, the material and spiritual aspects of the universe which God has created. Man is, in one sense, a microcosmos, for he unites the two disparate spheres of substantial existence.[1] He moves in two worlds. As we shall see, the disorder which man perceives in himself and in the cosmos is not the result of material existence or of an ontological "fault" in the cosmos. It is rather, the result of disorder within the very being of man, a disorder which exists at the center of his being, in his "heart" to use Victorine terminology.

---

[1] Cf. the consideration of God, created (rational) spirit, and matter (corpora) in DS, I, iii, 17f., MPL 176:223B-224D, Def., pp. 48ff. The idea of The "three eyes" reflects this triadic structure also; cf. infra.

[2] Cf. the texts collected in Vernon J. Bourke (ed.), The Essential Augustine, pp. 43-66.

[3] Cf. De Wulf, History, I, 212: "In his exegesis of pseudo-Dionysius, Hugh clearly manifests his antipathy for pantheism.. . ." Cf. F. Vernet, "Hughes de Saint-Victor," DTC, VII, i, 265, and E. Gilson, "Maxime, Erigene, S. Bernard," BGPTMA, Supp. Bd. III, i, 188-95.

[4] On the creation of angels and men, cf. DS, I, v and vi, MPL 176:245-288, Def., pp. 74-120.

Since the soul was a spiritual substance, it was one, simple, and immortal. It was also rational and was created directly, ex nihilo by God.[2] These characteristics the soul shared with the other created rational spirits in the universe, the angels. However, union with the body differentiated the soul from all other rational spirits and opened the soul to the direct experience of a dimension of reality denied to the angels.[3] Through the bodily sense, as we have noted, the soul of man has knowledge of the external world of visible objects.

Although Hugh conceived the soul as a single undivided unity he spoke of three faculties of the soul. Eschewing the Platonic division of the faculties of the soul, Hugh followed the Aristotelian division as it transmitted to the early medieval period by Boethius. Plato divided the powers of the soul into reason, courage, and desire.[1] Hugh divided the soul into the vegetative, sensitive, and rational faculties.[2] The vegetative power had to do with bodily subsistence and reproduction. The sensitive and rational faculties were associated with the cognitive aspects of existence. These faculties of the soul were not absolutely distinct from the substance of the soul. Hugh admitted a distinction, but it was not that of substance and accident in the manner of Aquinas.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Hom. in Eccl., XII, MPL 175:191C. On the theme of microcosmos cf. Ph. Delhaye, Le Microcosmus de Godefroy de Saint-Victor, étude théologique (Lille, 1951), esp. pp. 140ff. and 150ff; Chenu, TDS, pp. 19-51; and P. Allers, "Microcosmus from Anaximandros to Paracelsus," Traditio, II (1944), 318-407.

[2] On the nature of the soul and Hugh's psychological theory, cf. Ostler, Die Psychologie, pp. 14-96, with substantial consideration of Hugh's sources. De Wulf says, History, I, 213, "Psychology was his favourite study, as we should expect in a mystic. His system was inspired by Augustine and pseudo-Augustinian theories . . . ." Cf. also Kleinz, Theory of Knowledge, pp. 20ff.

[3] DS, I, vi, 1, MPL, 176:264BC, Def., pp. 94f.

The sensitive and rational powers of the soul were frequently distinguished by Hugh under the rubric of outer and inner senses, respectively. The outer sense had to do with the external, visible, material world; the inner sense, with the internal, invisible, spiritual world. In possessing inner and outer sense, man was placed in a middle position, as it were, between the angels who have only a knowledge of the invisible world, and animals who have only knowledge of the external world.

---

[1] Cf. the Republic, IV, 441; VI, 504. Cited by Kleinz, Theory of Knowledge, p. 24, n. 26.

[2] Cf. Did., I, 3, Butt., pp. 7f., Tay., pp. 48f. Cf. Boethius, in Isag. Porphr. comm., I (CSEL, XLVIII, 136) and Aristotle, Nichom. Ethics, I, 13; VI, 2. Cf. Kleinz, Theory of Knowledge, p. 25.

[3] Cf. Kleinz, Theory of Knowledge, p. 24, and Gilson, Spirit, p. 445, n. 4.

> Now the rational soul was on this account equipped with a two fold sense, that it might grasp visible things without through the flesh, and invisible things within through reason, so that both visible and invisible things might excite it to praise of the Creator . . . . The sense of the angels was within, and the sense of brute animals was without . . . . And man was placed in a middle position, that he might have sense within and without; within for invisible things, without for visible; within through the sense of reason, without through the sense of the flesh, . . .[1]

This dialectic of inner and outer senses is a recurring theme of the Ark treatises and we shall have opportunity to see the way in which this plays a critical role in the Victorine understanding of the manner of man's restoration.

In accord with his doctrine of the two-fold nature of man, composed of body and soul, Hugh taught that from the very beginning of things two goods had been prepared for man by his Creator.[2] How little Hugh held a negative view of the body as such is readily apparent from the provision of valid goods and pleasures for the bodily existence of man. The relationship of body and soul might prove elusive in explication, and Hugh's Platonic anthropology might tend to emphasize a dichotomy in man, but finally the Biblical insistence upon the goodness of the world and of man's whole person dominated. Hugh, like Augustine, never reconciled the Biblical insistence that the human person is a unity, a "living spirit," with his idea of a composite of body and soul.[1] But he could avoid a platonizing degradation of the body, and this he did do to a great degree.

---

[1] DS, I, vi, 5, MPL 176:266BD, Def., p. 97.

[2] Cf. DS, I, vi, 6, MPL 176:267B-268B, Def., pp. 98f. "But since man had been composed of a twofold nature, that he might be wholly blessed, he had its two goods. His Creator from the beginning prepared one visible, the other invisible; . . . One belonged to the flesh, the other to the spirit, . . ." The discussion by Lasić, Théologia perfectiva, pp. 91ff., is vitiated by the distinction of "natural" and "supernatural" goods in a Thomistic sense; cf. esp. pp. 137ff.

In constructing the doctrine of the two goods the principle of hierarchical order was, as to be expected, fully operative. One good was visible, corporeal, and transitory; the other, invisible, spiritual, eternal.[2] The former was given to man at the moment of his creation. It was the whole created order of earthly things, the work of creation. This first of the "two works" comprising the sum total of divine activity was carried out expressly to serve man by providing for his necessities and furnishing pleasure for him.[3] In Hugh's metaphorical language, the work of creation, the visible good given man, was made for "man standing," i.e. for man in the perfection of creation.[4] The second divine "work," the work of restoration, was made to serve "man fallen."

---

[1] On Augustine's problem, cf. Gilson, *Augustine*, p. 47: "The better Augustine understood the content of his Christian faith, the better he understood the fact that, according to the Scriptures, God did not create a soul in creating Adam, but a man: *Let us make man* (Gen. 1, 26), and that the fashioning of Adam's body was actually the fashioning of a man (Gen. 2,7) . . . . To justify Christian intuitions he had at his disposal only a Plotinian technique, and the result was that he bequeathed to the Middle Ages formidable problems for which none but Saint Thomas found the solution." Hugh was one of the inheritors of the Augustinian dilemma. For the Biblical doctrine of man, cf. E. Jacob, *Theology of the Old Testament*, trans. A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock (New York, 1958), pp. 157-183; and L. Köhler, *Old Testament Theology*, trans. A. S. Todd (Philadelphia, 1958) pp. 129-183.

[2] Cf. *DS*, I, vi, 6, MPL 176:267B-268B, Def., pp. 98f.

[3] *Ibid.* Cf. *ibid.*, prol., iii, and I, ii, 1, MPL 176:184B and 206B, Def., pp. 4 and 29.

[4] *A. morl.*, IV, 11, MPL 176:672A, Sq., p. 137.

The second good which God prepared for man at the time of creation, the invisible good, was not given to man in creation. It was promised to him as the fulfillment of obedience. It was a reward.[1] This invisible good was the *visio Dei*, the "excellence of divine contemplation" which the angels and saints enjoy in heaven.[2] This was, then, the *telos* of human existence in the perfection of creation: To use the material world in such a way as to answer the necessities of bodily life and provide for right pleasure but to keep always in the forefront the ultimate end of life, which was to remain in obedience to God and finally to come into His presence. The Creator provided in the order of creation that the natural instincts of man should be sufficient for maintaining the proper use of the world on the presupposition that the fundamental relationship to God remained intact.[3] The final reward of the second, invisible good proposed to man depended, however, not upon the innate judgment of man but rather upon his obedience to the divine will.[4] The visible good was given *gratis*; the invisible good was promised *gratis*, but only upon condition of man's faithful response to the divine initiative.[5]

Earlier, the ontological "middle place" of the human soul was noted. Now we see man placed in another "middle place," this time in a position of volitional and moral significance. "Below" him were placed the necessary and useful goods of the material world. "Above" him were placed the joys and delights of the celestial beatitude of the visio Dei. Man was capable of choosing to seek one or the other as the ultimate end of existence. That he chose to seek the former, rather than the later as ultimate marked the Fall of man and the beginning of the work of restoration.

---

[1] Cf. *DS*, I, vi, 6, MPL 176:267B-268B, Def., pp. 98f.

[2] On the *visio Dei*, cf. our discussion, *infra.*

[3] Cf. *ibid.*, 7-9, 268B-269C, pp. 99ff. Also, *ibid.* 27f., 280C-281C, pp. 115f.

[4] Cf. *ibid.*, 6 and 29, 267B-268B and 281C-282D, pp. 98f. and 114f.

[5] *Ibid.*, 6, 267CD, p. 98.

It was a cardinal principle of Hugh's mystical teaching that in this life man cannot experience the direct, face-to-face visio Dei which the blessed saints in heaven enjoy.[1] The visio was established as the promised reward of obedience, and was to be given to man only after translation from life in this world to life in heaven. Had men persevered in obedience to the divine command and retained the perfection in which he was created, he would have advanced to his promised reward. Likewise, for man in the present fallen state of existence, no matter how great the degree of his spiritual restoration it is only through death that one comes to the visio:

> And once we have reached the limit of our personal perfection, we too are cut off from this life by death, so that we may be taken in to the banquet of the everlasting King . . . . for, when we behold His glory face to face, we shall delight in Him.[2]

If man had persevered in the perfection of creation he would have nevertheless lived a life in time with the possibility of a continued increase in knowledge and in perfection.[1] Likewise, the children of the first man would have lived a temporal existence and, significantly, would have gained their knowledge discursively in time.[2] Time, like materiality, was a part of the divine plan of creation and not the result of the Fall of man.

---

[1] Cf. DS, I, vi, 19 and 25, MPL 176:276B and 278CD, Def., pp. 108 and 111.

[2] A. morl., III, 14, MPL 176:661D 2A; also cf. ibid., I, 10 and 15, 625A and 631D-632A, Sq., pp. 57 and 67f., for similar statements.

Although Hugh was cautious and reserved in his analysis at this point, he affirmed the children of parents remaining obedient would not have been born with perfect knowledge. Instead they would have been born without the impediment of the guilt of original sin which in the present time prevents the attainment of full and necessary knowledge. As they matured these children would have gradually gained knowledge.

> We according to our opinion approve this rather, that the first man indeed, as we have said, should be believed to have been made immediately perfect both in body and in sense, but that those who would be born from him . . . would be born small, and then over intervals of time would receive increase both in sense of mind and in corporeal stature.[3]

---

[1] The perfection of creation, used here and elsewhere in connection with the state of man in the beginning, is to be identified with Hugh's idea of perfection "according to time." "That is perfect according to time which has whatever time requires and is suitable to be had according to time." DS, I, v, 17, MPL 176:253AB, Def., p. 82. This perfection does not exclude further development. Hugh distinguished three modes of perfection: According to time; according to nature, having "all that was either given or was due to its nature;" and universally perfect, "to which nothing is lacking." Cf. *ibid.*, 16-19, 253AB, p. 82. Note: The numbering of chapters in the text of DS here is that of Deferrari's translation. He divides Migne chap. 16 into four chaps., 16-19. Migne chap. 17 is thus chap. 20: "That the angels were founded perfect according to the first perfection." Deferrari gives no indication for the altered division, although judging from his preface one may assume he had manuscript evidence.

[2] Cf. DS, I, vi, 22-26, MPL 176:277A-280B, Def., pp. 109-113.

[3] *Ibid.*, 26, 278D-279A, p. 111.

In considering the perfection of man's created state, Hugh treated the nature and extent of the first man's knowledge. Here we find the ontological triad of God, the soul, and the world again playing a crucial role. In the state of perfection before the Fall, man possessed knowledge which was given him directly, without any recourse to rational reflection or discursive thought. This involved the three primary levels of reality: God, the soul, and the world.

> Now it is clear that the first man was instructed in a threefold knowledge, namely, knowledge of his Creator that he might know by whom he had been made, and knowledge of himself that he might know what he had been made and what should be done by him, lastly knowledge also of what had been made with him and what was to be made by him from it and in it.[1]

This knowledge which man received at his creation was given immediately and was not gained over a period of time by study, reflection, or teaching.

> He proceeded to that [knowledge] not by study or any teaching over periods of time but he received it simultaneously and immediately from the very beginning of his creation by a single and simple illumination of divine aspiration.[2]

The naming of the animals by man in the creation narrative of Genesis was evidence for Hugh that man "recognized the nature and the use and the offices of each [animal] from the reason implanted in him."[3] By sin man has not lost this original knowledge of the created order, nor has he lost the ability to provide for the bodily needs he feels. Thus, in Scripture very little has been said about the natural order of the world and the things within it. Man, even in his fallen state, is capable of knowing much, indeed very much, about the physical world. Knowledge of the physical world is the realm of the philosophers, and they have amassed a large body of material drawn from experience and reflection.[1] Their accomplishments are not to be slighted.[2] The position accorded the liberal arts and other philosophic disciplines in the *Didascalicon* shows this, as do the *opusculae* which Hugh composed for the *lector artium*.[3] But without a higher knowledge [wisdom] this knowledge [science] remains incomplete.[4] The philosophers have failed to perceive the Creator of the vast fabric of material and human universe which they have investigated. Herein lies the shortcoming of purely philosophic knowledge:

---

[1] DS, I, vi, 12, MPL 176:270D, Def., p. 102.

[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid., 13, 271A, pp. 102f.

---

[1] Cf. *DSSS*, I, and II, MPL 175:9-11. Cf. Baron, *Sci. et Sg.*, pp. 35-96, and Lasić, *Théologia perfectiva*, pp. 241ff. Schlette, *Nichtigkeit*, has a careful analysis of Hugh's attitude toward philosophy as "vanity" and as valuable.

[2] Hugh was no despiser of philosophy. Hauréau's comment is unacceptable: "Hugues de Saint-Victor a pres en degout la science elle-meme . . . ." *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique*, p. 424. Quoted Baron, *Sci. et Sg.*, p. 7, n. 30. Other similar statements quoted, with disapproval, by Vernet, "Hugues de Saint-Victor," DTC, VII, i, 257f.

[3] On Hugh's works meant for the *lector artium*, cf. Baron, *Sci. et Sg.*, pp. 35-96, and Lasić, *Théologia perfectiva*, pp. 204-236. In addition to the *Didascalicon*, we may cite as works for the *lector artium*: *Epitome in philosophiam*, *De grammatica*, *Practica geometriae*. All three have been edited by R. Baron and the critical texts collected in *Opera Propaedeutica*. Baron and van den Eynde differ on the chronological relationship of the *Épitomé* and the *Didascalicon*. Baron places the *Epitome* earlier, while van den Eynde finds the *Didascalicon* to be one of the earliest of Hugh's writings. Cf. van den Eynde, *Essai*, pp. 55-58, and Baron, *Sci. et Sg.*, pp. xlvif., *Etudes*, p. 77, and *Opera Propaedeutica*, pp. xi-xvii, with articles cited there.

[4] The distinction of wisdom/science was Augustinian, science (*scientia*) being knowledge of bodily things by inferior reason (*ratio inferior*), wisdom (*sapientia*) being knowledge of immutable truth by superior reason (*ratio superior*). Cf. *De Trin.*, xii, MPL 42:997ff. and V. J. Bourke, *Augustine's Quest of Wisdom* (Milwaukee, 1945), pp. 215ff. Hugh makes the distinction clearly in *De unione*, MPL 177:289A. Cf. Kleinz, *Theory of Knowledge*, p. 67f.

It is a truncated knowledge.[1] On the other hand, it is to be greatly respected and has a value all its own. But its value is greater when placed at the service of that which leads to the knowledge of the One who is Wisdom Himself.[2]

Because of the continuing ability of man to have adequate knowledge of the world through his own efforts, Hugh pointed out that there is very little in Scripture concerning the nature of the visible world and its parts. Scripture is concerned with the works of restoration; "worldly or secular writings," have as their subject the works of creation, i.e. the visible world.[3]

The second division of knowledge which man possessed from the beginning was knowledge of himself. Hugh defined this as:

> This, indeed, was to know himself, not to be ignorant of his foundation and order and obligation, whether above himself or in himself or under himself, to understand of what nature he was made and how he should proceed, what to do, what similarly to avoid. All this was to know himself.[4]

By self-knowledge, Hugh meant that man knew his place in the hierarchical structure of the world. Hugh accepted Augustine's interpretation of the Socratic precept "nosce te ipsum." For Augustine this Socratic injunction meant that the soul should realize and take its proper place,

---

[1] Cf., e.g., DSSS, I and II, MPL 175:9-11.

[2] Cf. DS, prol., vi, MPL 176:185C, Def., p. 5: "Therefore, it is clear that all the natural arts [i.e. liberal arts] serve divine science, and that the lower wisdom, rightly ordered, leads to the higher." On the unity of higher and lower wisdom, cf. esp. Taylor, Did., introd. and Baron, Sci. et Sg., passim.

[3] Cf. DSSS, II, MPL 175:11 and DS, prol., ii, MPL 176:183C-184A.

[4] DS, I, vi, 15, MPL 176:272AC, Def., 103f.

"which is beneath Him to whom it should be subject and above that which it should rule--above the body and under God."[1] The moral treatise on the Ark contained a very clear and succinct statement of the relationship which should have continued between the body, the soul, and the Creator of both:

> The first man's nature was so ordained and constituted by God that the soul, which governed the body, should fulfil outward service to the body, certainly, but that, by means of reason, it should always be directed inwardly towards its Maker . . . . As long, therefore, as man retained this order in his nature, he still remained within himself unmoved in purpose and in love, although his external activity subjected him to change.[2]

In knowing itself, the soul was aware of the position it occupied in the ontological hierarchy of the universe and the responsibilities which that position entailed. Man was, however, also granted free will.[3] The soul, in its middle position, as it were, was free to choose to maintain this primal order of subordination and domination, or to break it. The subsequent history of mankind is the narrative of the results of the rupture of this primal, created order and of the ensuing divine initiatives to effect a restoration of stability in the human personality and the human community via the works of restoration. The works of restoration, as we shall see shortly, were deeds done in time and were consequently part of the external world of which man was unimpaired perception. The purpose of these works, among other things, was to call man back to himself, to recall him to a new consideration of his true nature and his true vocation.[1]

---

[1] Gilson, Augustine, p. 3; Gilson refers to De Trin., X, 5, 7, MPL 42:977, cf. n. 2 on p. 249.

[2] A. Morl., I, 2, MPL 176:619/20, Sq., p. 46.

[3] On free will, cf. DS, I, vi, 4 and 16, MPL 176:265C-266B and 272D-273B. Cf. Lasic, Théologia perfectiva, pp. 142ff.

The third kind of knowledge possessed by the first man without "study or teaching" was knowledge of his Creator. At the outset of our discussion of this, it is wise to recall Hugh's final words on this in De sacramentis christianae fidei: "It is difficult, indeed, to explain the mode of the knowledge of God which that first man is believed to have had, . . ."[2] Baron hardly knows what to do with the idea that the first man had an immediate sense of the existence and presence of God. He concludes that Dionysian influence upon Hugh may make the idea more understandable in Hugh's thought, but it does not necessarily make it more acceptable.[3] Vernet was content to expound Hugh's position without noticeable comment.[4]

Yet given the difficulty which Hugh sensed in explicating this matter, the Victorine was equally certain of the actuality of such an experience. He continued his admission of the difficulty by flatly stating that, despite the problems in explanation, "he (the first man) taught visibly through internal inspiration, in no way could have doubted about his Creator Himself."[1]

---

[1] Cf., e.g., A.morl., IV, 10, MPL 176:674B, Sq., p. 136: "God, therefore, wishing to collect our hearts from this distracted state, and to recall them to the contemplation of interior joys, speaks outwardly, in order that He may exhort us to return into ourselves." Cf. also Did., I, 1, Butt., pp. 4-6, Tay., pp. 46f., on the knowledge of self and wisdom.

[2] DS, I, vi, 14, MPL 176:272C, Def., p. 103.

[3] Sci. et Sg., p. 172.

[4] "Hugues de Saint-Victor," DTC, VII, i, 264f.

De arca Noe morali vigorously stated this Hugonian position and placed it in the added dimension of the correlation of knowledge and love in man's relationship to God: "The sight of Him enlightened his mind with knowledge, and made him to rise up and to lie down with love."[2] In a longer statement Hugh linked this knowledge and the love engendered to the possession of immortality by the first man, through participation in that immortality which God has by nature:

> The first man, then, was made in such a way that, if he had not sinned, the power of contemplation would have kept him always in his Maker's presence. By always seeing Him he would always have cleaved to Him, and by always cleaving to Him who is immortal, he too would have possessed in Him life without end.[3]

This contemplative knowledge and the love generated were also the key to the stability of the first man's existence. Indeed, such is the key for the stability of all existence.

> The human heart, which . . . kept its stability in cleaving to divine love and remained on in the love of the One, . . .[4]

The thrust of Hugh's concern to establish the primal contemplative experience of God in the perfection of creation now begins to emerge. The fabric of the divine-human relationship and, indeed, the fabric of the human personality was properly ordered only when man centered his existence upon the love of God, amor Dei.[1] But, in order to love God, one must know Him. "Everyone who knows Him, loves Him, and . . . nobody can love Him without knowing Him."[2] Consequently, immediate knowledge of God was a fundamental prerequisite for the proper order in man's life. The constant dialectic of love and knowledge runs like a thread through all of Hugh of St. Victor's thought. One cannot escape the fact that man loves; his fundamental problem is the object of his love, and God is the only enduring, unchanging, and fulfilling Object which man can find.[3] Yet how does man know God? For God is absolutely other than man and the created order. Knowledge of God by "internal inspiration" solved the question for the order established in creation. But sin broke that order, and the quest of man becomes the quest for knowledge of God. Now, in this life, the knowledge man has of God is the knowledge by way of faith, "through a glass darkly," which Hugh contrasts, like Paul, with the ultimate knowing, which will be "face to face." This is a theme to which we shall return.

---

[1] Cf. supra, n. 1.

[2] A. morl., IV, 10, MPL 176:671A, Sq., p. 135.

[3] A. morl., I, 2, MPL 176:619/20, Sq., p. 46. Man did not possess immortality by nature, cf. DS, I, vi, 18, MPL 176:275A-276B, Def., pp. 107f.

[4] Ibid., p. 47.

---

[1] This is the theme of the Ark treatises in toto, but cf. esp. Ibid., 2 and 3, 619-621A, pp. 46-49 in particular. "Let us then see what we can do to attain the love of God, for He will integrate and stabilize our hearts, . . ." Ibid., 3, 620A, p. 48.

[2] Ibid., 5, 621D, p. 50.

[3] Cf. the opening exchanges on love in De arrha animae, MPL 176:951Cff., Müller, pp. 1ff., Herbert, pp. 13ff., where this is poignantly reflected. Also, cf. the short fragment, Quid vero diligendum sit, which Baron has edited as part of De substantia dilectionis in "Rapports . . .," Rev. Ét. august., V (1954), pp. 428f., with introd., pp. 421-425; a French trans. is in Baron, Textes spirituels, pp. 40-42. This fragment again underscores the inability of the human soul to exist without love, and the consequent problem of seeking the true and perfect good in order to love it. The true good is God. The second part of this fragment has a strong echo of the Ark treatises in its use of the motifs of the flood which symbolizes the instability of the world and events and the Ark which one builds in the heart to escape this flood.

The descriptions of this primal contemplative experience lack a certain precision. De sacramentis christianae fidei offers the most systematic statement. The Ark treatises contain perhaps the first statements of the theme.

The knowledge which man had of his Creator in the beginning must be distinguished from "that knowledge which is received from without by hearing alone."[1] It was not "that knowledge whereby God absent is now sought in faith by believers." The primal knowledge was "ministered within through inspiration," so that "through the presence of contemplation He was then perceived more manifestly by the knowing." A sort of via negativa defined this knowledge. While Hugh could say what it was not, it was difficult to give a positive analysis. Finally Hugh was content to insist that the knowledge of God possessed by the first man was more than the present knowledge of God through faith and less than the future knowledge of God enjoyed by the saints in the beatific vision. By excluding the two polar terms, Hugh could define a "region of experience" in which the primal contemplative experience might be located, despite the difficulty in adequately describing it.

The idea of progress was inherent in the concept of this primal knowledge. It was perfect in the sense of initial perfection. Increased knowledge of God with passing time was to be expected.

> If the obedience of man had persisted, very much would have been added to that same knowledge through subsequent revelation.[2]

---

[1] This and the following from DS, I, vi, 14, MPL 176:271CD, Def., p. 103.

[2] Ibid., 271D. Deferrari's translation has been corrected to read "obedience" instead of "disobedience." Cf. the Migne text.

Consistently the primal knowledge of God emerged as an experience of inwardness and immediacy. Hugh spoke of it as the "inward light of contemplation," "ministered . . . within through inspiration," and "internal inspiration."[1] Beyond such statements as these our Victorine contemplative had little desire to go. The reader was left to make his own connections with the remaining fabric of Hugh's mystical teaching and his psychology which was so intimately bound up with his mysticism.

In *De arca Noe morali* we find the primal contemplative experience correlated in one place with the *acies mentis*: "The depth of his spirit [*acies mentis*] was always unfailingly turned towards that one object, his Maker."[2] Here is a point of connection with an important Augustinian notion.[3] It also points to the later mystical tradition, for "it is essentially the same as that *fond* of the soul which later spiritual writers will call the *pointe suprême*."[4]

The primal experience also bore a relation to the third eye of the famous Hugonian notion of the "Three Eyes."[5] The eye of contemplation (*oculis contemplationis*), which Hugh described as being able to see "God within itself and the things which were in God, . . ."[1] obviously has a close kinship with the primal contemplative experience. Especially is this true since Hugh noted that following the sin of man, "the eye of contemplation indeed was extinguished so that it saw nothing, . . ."[2] This is precisely what he said about the inward contemplative experience of the first man.

---

[1] *DS*, I, vi, 14, MPL 176:271C, Def., p. 103, and *A.morl.*, I, 2, MPL 176:619/620, Sq., p. 46. Cf. *ibid.*, IV, 9 and 10, 668A and 671A, Sq. pp. 132 and 135. In chap. 9 Hugh adopted an aural metaphor: "The first man . . . possessed an ear within his heart by which he could hear God's voice after a spiritual manner."

[2] *Ibid.*, 10, 671A, Sq. p. 135.

[3] Cf. p. 135, n. 1 of the English trans. of *A.morl.* where Augustine's *Enarratio in Psalmum CXLIV*, MPL 37:1872, is cited along with *De vera religione*, LIV, MPL 34:169.

[4] Cf. p. 135,n.1 of the English trans. of *A. morl.*

[5] On this important concept, cf. our discussion *infra*.

Immediacy was a particularly important characteristic of the initial knowledge of God which man possessed. Throughout his discussion in De sacramentis christianae fidei Hugh clearly intended to set this knowledge of God apart from that knowledge gained by rational reflection, whether the reflection be on the nature of the human soul or on the visible universe as a visible sign of the nature of the invisible God. Both of these ways of approaching and attaining a knowledge of God were available to man initially, but they required a period of time for their acquisition.[3] Thus, it is impossible to assimilate them to the kind of knowledge of which Hugh spoke when he said that this initial knowledge of God was "not acquired by study or any teaching over periods of time, but received simultaneously and immediately from the very beginning of his creation . . . ."[4] Hugh had much to say about the knowledge of God which man, enlightened by God's grace in his erstwhile fallen state can have concerning the existence and nature of God. But this type of knowledge, gained by discursive reason based upon reflective experience of the world and the self, was not equivalent to the knowledge of God possessed by the first man. That was forever lost to man within the bounds of this world when he turned from God, exercising his free-will in pride. Restored and brought to the heavenly banquet man will have knowledge surpassing the knowledge possessed by the first man; this too was the knowledge to which the first man himself would have finally progressed had he remained obedient and advanced in the life established for him in creation.

---

[1] DS, I, x, 2, MPL 176:329C, Def., p. 167.

[2] Ibid., 329D.

[3] Cf. DS, I, iii, MPL 176:217ff., Def., pp. 41ff. for the various approaches Hugh took. Also, cf. De trib. dieb., MPL 176:811Cff. Cf. Kilgenstein, Die Gotteslehre.

[4] DS, I, vi, 12, MPL 176:270D.

The importance of this primal contemplative experience in the total scheme of Hugh's theology cannot be overestimated. And it is essential that it be assessed correctly. Hugh taught, without doubt, than man _as created_, as part of his _natural_ endowment possessed in reality an ongoing contemplative experience of the divine presence.[1] The theme appears too often in the Ark treatises and in _De sacramentis christianae fidei_ to be overlooked or misunderstood. Here again is the dualism of Augustinian Platonism which Hugh espoused. The soul has "two faces" one of which is turned toward the world of spiritual realities and God, the other of which is turned toward the material world.[2] And in the state of created perfection it was natural that the soul should have perceived that highest Reality, God. Köster has stated this most vigorously:

---

[1] The word "natural" is used here in the first of the three senses distinguished by Hugh in _A. myst._ V, MPL 176:689A: "That integral and uncorrupted good in which the first man was created."

[2] Cf. Chenu, _TDS_, p. 117.

> Hugh knows nothing of the supernatural nature of the immediate contemplative experience of God. The impossibility of such is factual and actual; it is not due to a principle nor is it essential. It is not that the possibility of the contemplative experience of God is supernatural; it is that the impossibility of it is unnatural.[1]

This means that the works of restoration are precisely what the name implies: They are the divine activity of restoring to man that which he has lost through sin. They are not the action of grace "adding" something to nature. Grace, in Hugh's vocabulary, was not elevation of man's nature to an higher level of being, as in the theology of Aquinas. It was the divine act of healing a nature which had become deformed in its very essence. The fact that Hugh spoke of the sacraments as medicine for a sick man is of more than passing significance.[2] It goes to the core of his soteriology.

As M.-D. Chenu has pointed out for the twelfth century in general the function of grace was conceived as a restoration of nature. In short, grace had the effect of "re-naturing."[3]

The fundamental role of the primal contemplative experience emerges in several passages in De arca Noe morali. It was by means of this experience that the first man had the knowledge of God which inspired the love of God in his heart. And from this adherence of love came the stability of life which the first man enjoyed.

---

[1] Die Heilslehre, p. 42.

[2] Cf. DS, I, ix, 5, MPL 176:323BC, Def., p. 160. Cf. also A. morl. IV, 11, MPL 176:272A, Sq., p. 137.

[3] TDS, p. 504. See further refs. there.

> The sight of Him [God] enlightened his mind with knowledge, and made him to rise up and to lie down with love.[1]
>
> The first man, then was made in such a way that, if he had not sinned, the power of contemplation would have kept him always in his Maker's presence. By always seeing Him he would thus always have loved Him, by always loving Him he would always have cleaved to Him, . . . The human heart [would have] kept its stability in cleaving to divine love and remained one in the love of the One. . . .[2]

As knowledge and love are coordinate aspects of the relationship between God and man, the immediate, undoubted sense of God's presence to the first man formed the basis for the love which the first man showed to God.

Hugh's epistemology and his conception of the nature and role of faith, along with his understanding of the scheme of man's restoration were all vitally affected by the conception of the knowledge of God possessed by the first man and the role this knowledge played in his life.

A major motif in Hugh's thought which reflects the knowledge man possessed in the perfection of creation and also shows the noetic effect of sin is that of the "Three Eyes."

The "Three Eyes" idea appeared twice in Hugh's writings: First, in the commentary In hierarchiam coelestam;[3] second, in De sacramentis christianae fidei.[4] In both contexts the matter at hand was the knowledge which man has of God in the present state of existence conditioned by the fact of sin. As we shall see, however, Hugh's presentation of the three eyes has implications for more than the knowledge of God.

---

1. A.morl., IV, 10, MPL 176:671A, Sq., p. 135.

2. Ibid., I, 2, 619/20, p. 46. 3. Lib. III, MPL 175:975D-976A.

4. Lib. III, MPL 175:975D-976A.

The outline of the idea should be sketched first. Just as there are three levels of being, i.e.body, spirit,and God, the soul possesses three "eyes."[1] The eye of the flesh (_oculis carnis_) sees the world and the things that are in the world. The eye of reason (_oculis rationalis_) sees the soul and the things that are within the soul. The eye of contemplation (_oculis contemplationis_) sees God and the things which are in God (_Deum et ea quae in Deo erant_).[2] Or, to put it another way, the eye of the flesh sees things outside man (_ex se_); the eye of reason, those within man (_in se_); and the eye of contemplation, things in the depths of man's being and above it (_intra se et supra se_).[3] The eyes, therefore, represent an ascension in the Victorine order of being and an increasing interiorization of consciousness. The eye of contemplation sees that which is innermost in man. This is, or rather was in the perfection of creation, the presence of God within man's soul.

The figure of the "eye" was one of long standing use to represent the cognitive function or functions of the mind. Plato had used the metaphor, as had the Neoplatonists especially Plotinus. The fathers of the church had adopted the usage. Origen, Augustine, Greogry the Great,

---

[1] _DS_, I, x, 2, MPL 176:329C-330A, Def., p. 167.

[2] For the best treatment of the theme of the three eyes, Weisweiller, "Sacramentum fidei, " pp.444ff. Cf. Baron, _Sci. et Sg._ pp. 194f,; Ostler, _Die Psychologie_, pp. 119-23; Köster, _Die Heilslehre_, pp. 34-36; Lasic, _Theologia perfectiva_, pp. 123-35; Schlette, _Die Nichtigkeit_, pp. 90-99; and Überweg-Geyer, _Grundriss_, II, 265.

[3] _IHC_, III, MPL 175:976A.

Gregory the Great and Boethius transmitted the metaphor to the Middle Ages.[1] Although such antecedents for this use of oculis can be cited, the threefold structure of the eyes as used by Hugh appears to be his own idea.[2]

In the present state of human existence the three eyes do not possess an equal capacity for perception.[3] Only the eye of the flesh is sound and is able to perceive its objects clearly and certainly. The eye of reason is weakened and bleary (lippus) such that it sees only in part and even that without clarity. The eye of contemplation is completely unable to see anything. It is shut and blind (clausus et caecus).

Man's noetic capacity is severely curtailed. He has no immediate knowledge of God. He is profoundly ignorant. Man's rational faculty is reduced in effectiveness. He has lost the clear understanding of the nature of the soul and the world of spiritual realities.[4] Also, reason is no longer absolutely certain in the conclusions which it reaches. Only the ability of man to perceive the external world of physical reality remains unimpaired.

---

[1] Cf., e.g., Plato, Phaedo, 67ab; Plotinus, Enneads, I, 6,8; Origen, Comm. in Cant., II, 9, GCS, VIII, 166-68; Augustine, De Trin., XV, 27, 49; Gregory, Mor., V, 61 and XXIII, 42f.; Boethius, De consol. phil., V. pros., 4. Cf. Lasic, Théologia perfectiva, p. 123, n. 195; also Arnou, "Platonisme des Peres," DTC, XII, ii, 2376-81.

[2] This is the opinion of Weisweiller, "Sacramentum fidei," p. 444. However, von Ivanka is of the opinion, as also Uberweg-Geyer, that the direct antecedents can be found in Augustine and Boethius. Cf. von Ivanka, Plato Christianus (Einsiedeln, 1964), pp. 379f., also, pp. 333ff.; Überweg-Geyer, Grundriss, II, 265.

[3] Cf. IHC, III, MPL 175:976A, and DS, I, x, 2, MPL 176:329CD, Def., p. 167.

[4] Cf. the penetrating comments on the soul's ignorance of self in Did., I, 1, Butt., pp. 4ff., Tay., pp. 46ff.

> Hence it is that the hearts of men more easily agree with themselves in those things which they perceive with the eye of the flesh than in those things which they attain by the keenness of mind and by the sense of reason, since where they are not cloudy in seeing they do not waver in judging.[1]

This weakness in the rational ability of man accounts for the fact that although the ancient philosophers were able to know much about the world by observing it, their conclusions were a mixture of the true and the false. Add to this the fact that they lacked any perception of the ultimate Reality, God; and Hugh concluded, you may well count their works "in error" (frustra) and "truncated."[2]

In both of the settings in which it is found the three eyes theme was primarily oriented toward the problem of the knowledge of God. In the In hierarchiam the theme appeared in the midst of an extended discussion of the possibility of knowing God and of forming conceptions of the divine. The three eyes theme appears to have fulfilled two functions. First, it was employed to point out that the capacity to know God is something differing from the capacity to know the sensible world or the interior world of the soul. Each level of reality has its own "sense." Second, the schematic made clear that man, in this life, does not possess the possibility of knowing God as he is. The eye of contemplation has been extinguished; it is blind and closed.

Hugh opened the section by announcing, "Give ear now to a great mystery (Audi magnum sacramentum). What God is, is above all; if anyone seeks what He is, this cannot be expressed, for it cannot be thought."[1] This was a restatement of the Dionysian theme of "negative theology."[2] Hugh continued by pointing out that the language man uses to express his thoughts is formed on the basis of his experience of either the external world of objects or the internal world of the mind, i.e. through the eye of the flesh or the eye of reason.[3] God is beyond either of these spheres of experience. He is absolutely transcendent. He is, in a word, "unknowable" or "unthinkable" (incogitabilis). Men use the word Deus to speak of God.[4] But they err if they think that the concept which accompanies this word corresponds to God as he is. The same thing holds for the title "Creator." Everything which is said of God is said "according to something" (secundum quid).

---

[1] DS, I, x, 2, MPL 176:329D, Def., p. 167.

[2] Cf. DSSS, I and II, MPL 175:9-11.

---

[1] IHC, III, MPL 175:975A.

[2] "[Apophaticism] is, above all, an attitude of mind which refuses to form concepts about God. Such an attitude utterly excludes all abstract and purely intellectual theology which would adapt the mysteries of the wisdom of God to human way of thoughts." Vladimir Lossky, The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church, trans. by a small group of members of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Serguis (London, 1957), pp. 38f. Cf. Baron, Études, pp. 184-213, "Le Commentaire de la Hierarchie Celeste par Hugues de Saint Victor: IV. Symbolisme, théophanisme, connaissance de Dieu, "esp. pp. 205ff. Cf. Dionysius, Myst. Theol., III, trans. Gandillac, Oeuvres.

[3] Cf. IHC, III, MPL 175:975AD. Cf. the exposition of this line of Hugh's thought in Weisweiller, "Sacramentum fidei," pp. 442ff.

[4] Cf. IHC, III, MPL 175:976Df; also DS, I, x, 2, MPL 176:328CD, Def., p. 166.

Man has at his disposal only symbols or images with which to talk of God. And, as Hugh observed, "the image is very far from the truth" (image longe a veritate est).[1] Yet the image and the symbol have value; Hugh could not remain with the via negativa. Corrected and sensitized by the apophatic way, one can follow the cataphatic way of an ascending series of symbols:

> It is impossible to represent (demonstrari) invisible things except by means of those which are visible. Therefore all theology of necessity must have recourse to visible representations in order to make known the invisible.[2]

Herein is the foundation for symbolica demonstratio[3] and for the Victorine sense of the sacramental universe and sacramental life.

In De sacramentis the theme of the three eyes was placed in a context more explicitly oriented toward the fall of man and the means whereby he may be restored. Knowledge of God was still the central concern, but the lengthy reflection upon the language of theology was greatly compressed. Hugh again stressed the unknowability of God, drawing upon the parallel context in the In hierarchiam.[4]

This unknowability was now placed within the perspective of original sin. God is unknowable because man has ruptured the once-operative bond of the contemplative experience.

---

[1] IHC, III, MPL 175:977A. [2] Ibid., I, i, 926D.

[3] Ibid., II, 941C.

[4] Cf. DS, I, x, 2, MPL 176:329AB, Def., pp. 166f., and IHC, III, MPL 175:973ff.

> As long, therefore, as it kept these eyes open and uncovered it saw clearly and discerned rightly, but, after the shades of sin had entered in upon it, the eye of contemplation indeed was extinguished so that it saw nothing, but the eye of reason was made bleared so that it saw doubtfully.[1]

Since this experience was the very root and ground of the love which man showed to God, and that love was the point of stability and unity for man, the problem of the knowledge of God becomes intimately related to the possibility of man's restoration. God is now absent. Man's experience is limited to the external world of objects, the internal mental universe of invisible realities, and to emotions which man feels. None of these are commensurate in any degree with God or with the future goods which God promised to man. Therefore man needs faith. Faith becomes, as it were, the new relationship which man sustains with God in light of the disaster of the first sin and the consequent loss of the contemplative vision and of the adherence of *amor Dei*.

As Chatillion has justly remarked, it is impossible to understand the thought of Hugh of St. Victor without a clear appreciation of his teaching on the nature and effect of the Fall of man.[2] All of Hugh's thought was literally set within the context of the primal disaster which reduced man from the perfection of creation to the ruin of his present state of existence.[1] In this connection Hugh thought it necessary to distinguish three states of man, i.e. before sin, after sin, and after the resurrection from the dead:

---

[1] *DS*, I, x, 2, MPL 176:329CD, Def., p. 167.

[2] "Une écclésiologie médiévale: l'idee de l'Église dans la théologie de l'école de Saint-Victor au XIII^{e} siècle," *Irenikon*, XXII (1949), 115-38 and 395-411. Cited hereafter as Chatillon, "Une écclésiologie."

> The first state of man was before sin, in that which he was founded. The second state is after sin, (if, however, it must be called a state, and not rather ruin), into which, through sin and the punishment of sin following after sin, he fell. The third state of man will be after the resurrection from the dead, when he will be completely and perfectly freed not only from sin but also from the punishment of sin, and he will be restored not only to that in which he was created, but above that also even for which he was created.[2]

We have already noted the perfection of knowledge enjoyed by man in the state before sin, and the unity and stability given to his life through the knowledge of God and the accompanying love of God which marked the first state of existence. After man's disobedience to the divine command, his life was marked by attributes the inverse of the knowledge and love of God, namely ignorance and concupiscence. Added to these was the punishment of bodily mortality. These three then mark the present state of human existence under the shadow of sin: Ignorance, concupiscence, and mortality.[3] This is the disease for which man seeks a remedy.

---

[1] Cf. Squire, SSW, pp. 27f.

[2] DS, I, vi, 10, MPL 176:269D-270A, Def., p. 101.

[3] Cf. the concise statement in DS, I, viii, 1, MPL 176:305C, Def., p. 141.

Hugh emphasized equally the noetic and volitional consequences of sin and in this he stood apart from the general tendency of his time.[1] Augustine was Hugh's model at this point, for he too had emphasized ignorance and concupiscence equally.[2] But in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries a significant shift of emphasis can be observed. Anselm of Canterbury, by nature of his non-Augustinian interpretation of the pre- and post-lapsarian state of man falls outside the scope of the discussion here.[3] However, the Sententiae which originated in the circle of the School of Anselm of Laon and William of Champeaux, and the Libri quattor sententiarum of Peter the Lombard were set within a context of Augustinian thought.[4] Both of these works show an increased stress upon the aspect of concupiscence in discussing the effects of original sin upon man and a consequent decline of concern with the defect of ignorance. In this way the Augustinian balance between knowledge and virtue was upset radically. Throughout the writings of Hugh of St. Victor, however, the correlation of knowledge and virtue, and ignorance and concupiscence, was constant. In restoring man God had undertaken, Hugh said, "to illuminate unto the knowledge of the truth; to inflame unto the love of virtue."[1]

---

[1] For what follows cf. the important study by Lottin, Psychologie et morale, IV, pp. 11-76, and the numerous references to the studies by Weisweiller, Bliemetzrieder, Lottin, et al. For Hugh cf. esp. pp. 65-66.

[2] Cf. Portalie, Guide, p. 208: "Augustine says that concupiscence is original sin in the same way that ignorance or even death is, . . . This is so true that the most faithful of Augustine's disciples in the Middle Ages defined original sin in terms of both ignorance and concupiscence . . . ." (Citing Summa sententenarum, III, 11, MPL 176:107 and noting it falsely attributed to Hugh.) For a good summary on Augustine's doctrine cf. A. Gaudel, "Peche originel, "DTC, XII, i, 371-381, 392-402.

[3] Cf. Lottin, Psychologie et morale, IV, 13f. for brief summary.

[4] Cf. Ibid., pp. 58ff. and 73.

To illustrate the equal emphasis upon the defects of ignorance and concupiscence two examples may suffice. In the first place, Hugh considered lectio divina directed especially to the two particular needs of mankind. It furnishes a remedy for ignorance and concupiscence:

> In these two [allegory and tropology] we are instructed: For the cognition of truth, which is the integrity of faith, and for the love of goodness, which is for the perfection of good works.[2]
>
> Twofold is the fruit of sacred reading, because it either instructs the mind with knowledge or it equips it with morals. It teaches what it delights us to know and what it behooves us to imitate. Of these, the first, namely knowledge, has more to do with history and allegory, the other, namely instruction in morals, has more to do with tropology. The whole of sacred Scripture is directed to this end.[3]

The whole structure of philosophy also was a remedy for the debilitating effects of the primal tragedy. Philosophy, itself the pursuit of Wisdom, intends ultimately "to restore within us the divine likeness, . . ."

> Of all human acts or pursuits, then, governed as these are by Wisdom, the end and the intention ought to regard either the restoring of our nature's integrity, or the relieving of those weaknesses to which our present life lies subject . . . . The integrity of human nature, however, is attained in two things--in knowledge and virtue."[4]

---

1. DS, II, ii, 1, MPL 176:415D, Def., p. 254.

2. DSSS, XVI, MPL 175:24A; cf. chap. XIII, 20BC.

3. Did., V, 6, Butt., pp. 104f., Tay., pp. 127f.

4. Ibid., I, 5, Butt., p. 12, Tay., pp. 51f.

Recalling that the state of mankind is such that "ignorance of the good and desire for evil beset the mind of man; the weakness of mortality sickened his flesh" the *Epitome Dindimi in Philosophiam* noted that the pursuit of Wisdom, "a pursuit called 'philosophy'" provided a counter to these evils.[1] The theoretical division of philosophy sought the truth which would enlighten man's ignorance; the ethical, furthered the love of virtue to the eradication of wicked desire; the mechanical, sought to provide for the necessary conveniences which would aid in alleviating man's bodily weaknesses. The fourth division of philosophy, logic, which had according to Hugh but lately come upon the scene, completed the quaternary by providing a "form of polished discourse" for handling the "secrets of Wisdom."

The consequences of the loss of the knowledge and love of God in the Fall of man were developed with penetrating insight in the treatises on the Ark. Repeatedly Hugh returned to the theme of the stability enjoyed by the first man as he adhered to his God in love and ordered through reason the desires of the body to their proper end. Now this proper hierarchical order of God, spirit (or reason), and matter (or body) has been disrupted and man finds that rather than the world serving his needs, he has become a slave, as it were to the world.

> Never, therefore, could he be in any doubt about his Maker, who was ever present within him by contemplation. The sight of Him enlightened his mind with knowledge, and made him to rise up and to lie down with love. But after he was cast out from before God's face because of his transgression, he became blind and unstable, blind through mental ignorance and unstable through fleshly concupiscence. . . . For through ignorance men at last sank so low that they did not acknowledge their Creator. . . . And through concupiscence they were bewildered and led astray by countless falsehoods. For since men were thus subject to the darkness of ignorance

---

[1] Cf. the text, ed. Baron, *Opera Propaedeutica*, pp. 193-94. This trans. by Taylor, *Did.*, p. 12.

> and unaware of the existence of any other invisible good things, it was inevitable that they should lose control of themselves through the lust for earthly things which can be seen.[1]

God alone being immutable and eternal, He only could be the source of unending joy and perfect fulfillment for man. By the adhesion of love, man had participated in the goodness and beatitude of God, sharing also in his stability: "The human heart . . . kept its stability in cleaving to divine love and remained one in the love of the One. . . ."[2] Cast out from the vision of the invisible, able only to comprehend the visible world which he found about him, man turned to the objects within his view in search of fulfillment for his desires. In so doing, the human heart, once unified in the love of God, the supreme Good, became divided through love of a multiplicity of objects:

> The human heart . . . was as it were divided into as many channels as there were objects that it craved, once it had begun to flow in different directions through earthly longings.[3]

The material world, impermanent and insufficient in itself to serve as the final good of man, failed man in his search for satisfaction:

> Failing to find what it longs for in those things which it has, its desire is always reaching out in pursuit of the unattainable; and so it never has rest. Therefore, from movement without stability is born toil without rest, travel without arrival; . . .[4]

In a passage from De vanitate mundi, a work which repeated many of the basic themes of the Ark treatises, Hugh broke forth in a lament which eloquently expressed his profound horror of time and the effect of total dissolution which the flux and impermanency of time has upon human life and the meaning of existence.

---

[1] A. morl., IV, 10, MPL 176:674AB, Sq., p. 136f.

[2] Ibid., I, 2, 619/20, p. 46f.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., p. 47.

> R. It is a lengthy business to show the vanity of this world by going through particular cases. You do, however, realize that none of all the things that you are looking at abides. They all pass, and return to the place whence they arose. Just as they all have a beginning, so do they also have an end, though they take different courses and do not all reach their end together in the same way. Some have only lately come to be, others have long since perished, some are only half-way through their course, others at their birth are taking the place of those that existed before; but they are all alike passing away and going towards one place. O mighty flood, whither are you being borne away? Your source is insignificant, you break from a tiny spring, you well up from a trifling conduit. You flow and you grow, you run down and you are engulfed. O stream that fails not, O watercourse never still O whirlpool never sated! Whatever is subject to birth, whatever involves the debt of mortality, that does insatiable death gulp down. It never ceases to consume the one and ensnare the other, or to engulf them both. The present is always passing on, the future always following; and, since the continuity is unbroken, there is a belief that this is the permanent condition of things.[1]

The agony and despair of this passage has the sweep of the torrential waters of a flood. This is the world of which fallen man, if he be perceptive, is aware. What hope can he find within it? Before the Fall, time moved toward a *telos* which was the translation of each man to the *visio Dei*. With the rupture of this state by sin, man no longer experienced time as a succession of events moving toward a goal. It became a flux. The seasons were intended to renew and revive the world with offspring in order to provide unending sustenance by "renewing the old, re-establishing the fallen, and restoring the worn."[2] Now the passage of the seasons and years only brings the gnawing question:

> Where are our fathers? Where are those rich and mighty men . . . .
> Where, when all is said and done, are all those of whose friendship

---

1. Bk. II, MPL 176:711AC, Müller, pp. 36f., Sq., p. 171.

2. *De arrha animae*, Müller, p. 7, Herbert, p. 17.

and intimacy we used to feel so sure?[1]

Although never put so fervently and trenchantly in the two Ark treatises the heightened sense of the mutability of the material, temporal world as reflected in De vanitate mundi stood at the base of Hugh's thought.

> Let us contemplate the vast and horrible confusion that prevails in that world down there, and the infinite distraction in the minds of men.[2]

Contrasted to this confusion and distraction was the "perpetual, unshakable stability" of God.

We are at the central question of the Ark treatises: How is it possible for man to move from his present state of instability to some sort of stability? Ultimately the question comes out in terms of time and eternity: How can that which is mutable and temporal relate to that which is immutable and eternal? Like his mentor the Bishop of Hippo, Hugh resolved the dilemma within the dialectical structure of the two loves of man---or rather the one love which man may direct toward either of two objects: the world or God. The theme was: Amor dei/amor mundi. "The basic problem of the human situation is thus seen as the problem of right and wrong loves." And the solution of the problem lies in the "gradual invasion of the soul by charity."[3] Hugh put man's quest for the love of God succinctly in the opening portion of De arca Noe morali:

> Let us then see what we can do to attain the love of God, for he

---

[1] DVM, II, MPL 176:712B, Müller, p. 37, Sq., p. 172.

[2] A. morl., IV, 4, MPL 176:666B, Sq., p. 126.

[3] Squire, SSW, p. 28. He is of the opinion that the invasion of the soul by charity, while present as an idea in the Ark treatises, is not as prominent as in the later works specifically devoted to the subject.

> will integrate and stabilize our hearts, He will restore our peace and give us ceaseless joy."[1]

In a later opuscule on the subject of love, Hugh summed up this polar theme of the love of God and the love of the world with the recognition that it is one love which can seek either of two objects:

> A single spring of love, welling up within us, pours itself out in two streams. The one is the love of the world, cupidity; the other the love of God, charity. The heart of man is in fact the ground from which, when inclination guides it towards outward things, there breaks that which we call cupidity; although, when its desire moves it towards that which is within its name is charity.
>
> There are then, two streams that issue from the fount of love, cupidity and charity . . . . So all that is good derives from it and from it every evil comes.[2]

In this passage the important dialectic between outer and inner appears. The love of God is desire which is directed within to the interior world of spiritual realities and to God. Love of the world, cupidity, is directed outwardly. The dualism of matter and spirit which formed an integral part of Hugh's Augustinian-Platonic heritage is obvious. The juxtaposition of man's inward and outward sensibilities was a major motif of the Ark treatises. Instead of the three eyes, we find two senses. In the inner sense of man Hugh has combined the eyes of contemplation and reason. And in agreement with the three eyes idea, the Ark treatises show man to be inwardly blind and deaf.

The final tragedy of the Fall is that man has been turned totally "outward." He is bereft of any truly beneficial sensitivity to the spiritual dimension of the world. He is left with the material world. And even this visible world, intended in the wisdom of creation to serve man's needs and to function as a sign pointing to spiritual realities, has ceased to fulfill its created purpose.[1]

---

[1] A. morl., I, 3, MPL 176:620A, Sq., p. 48. Cf. the intention of man, in constructing the Ark in his heart, to "rise up strengthened to that supreme stability, the contemplation of God." Ibid., IV, 6, 667A, p. 128.

[2] De substantia dilectionis, trans. Sq., p. 187; text ed. Baron, "Rapports," p. 425.

Because of man's state, turned wholly outward and able to clearly perceive and interpret only what he sees in the world, the approach of God to man has taken this radically altered situation into account.

> Before he sinned, the first man had no need for God to speak to him outwardly, for he possessed an ear within his heart by which he could hear God's voice after a spiritual manner. But when he opened his outward ear to listen to the serpent's guile, he closed his inward ear to the voice of God.
> Since, therefore, man has lost the power to hear God speak within him, He when He recalls us to Himself, cries outwardly.[2]

> God, therefore, wishing to collect our hearts from this distracted state, and to recall them to the contemplation of interior joys, speaks outwardly, in order that He may exhort us to return into ourselves. But because a mind accustomed to things that can be seen cannot so soon rise up to unseen things, He Himself decided to perform some miracles that could be seen, whereby our attraction for Him might be strengthened and His love towards us proved. Now these things have a special connexion with man's restoration.[3]

Since, as Hugh said, faith is the beginning of man's restoration, let us turn now to consider this important facet of Hugonian thought.[4]

Hugh's treatment of the concept of faith was important not only in the context of his own thought.[1] It was very influential in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as his definition of faith was cited often.[2] Vernet says of Hugh's analysis of faith: "It is less summary than St. Anselm and the orthodox collections of sentences (*Sentences* of William of Champeaux and of Anselm of Laon), more penetrating and exact than Abelard and Gilbert of Porree."[3]

---

[1] On this change in man's relationship to the created universe, cf. infra.

[2] A. morl., IV, 9, MPL 176:669A, Sq., p. 132.

[3] Ibid., 10, 671B, p. 136.

[4] Hugh's statement is very significant: "Not unfittingly is faith, through which man begins in some manner to see the absent, said to be the beginning of good and the first step in his restoration; this restoration, indeed, increases according to increases of faith, while man is enlightened more through knowledge that he may know more fully, and is inflamed with love that he may love more ardently." DS, I, x, 9, MPL 176:342D-343A, Def., p. 181.

The point of departure for Hugh's consideration of faith was Hebrews 11:1: "Faith is the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of things that appear not." Each phrase had a particular significance. First, Hugh interpreted substance (*substantia*) to mean subsistence (*subsistentia*), thus finding support for the notion that the future goods which are promised by God subsist in the minds of believers in the present, although they have no knowledge of them in actuality (*per actum*).

> Faith is the substance, that is the subsistence, of things to be hoped for, that is of future goods which we hope will come and which alone are worthy of our hope and expectation since in them our good consists. Faith, therefore, is the substance of things to be hoped for, since the invisible goods which are not yet present through act [*per actum*] presently through faith [*per fidem*] subsist in our hearts, and faith itself in these things is their subsistence in us.[4]

Man's knowledge is confined to three categories of experience: Comprehension of corporeal bodies by sense; comprehension by the mind in some likeness through image; and comprehension of something which man feels, e.g., joy, sadness, fear, or love. The "invisible things of God" transcend all three and remain unknown to man, for they do not subsist in the mind through any action or presence. Therefore these future things of God's choosing must be believed, for they cannot be comprehended immediately by the mind of man.

---

[1] Cf. *DS*, I, x, MPL 176:327C-344A, Def., pp. 165-82. Some of the material in this section was taken from the earlier *DSLNS*, MPL 176:35-42. Cf. Weisweiller, "Hugos von St. Viktor Dialogus," pp. 179-208, esp. table on p. 197.

[2] Cf. Überweg-Geyer, *Grundriss*, II, 265. Several examples are given by Grabmann, *GSM*, II, 268ff.

[3] "Hugues de Saint-Victor," *DTC*, VII, i, 273.

[4] *DS*, I, x, 2, MPL 176:327D-328A, Def., p. 166.

The second phrase was correlated with man's knowledge of God and not with knowledge of future goods. "Not without reason is the evidence of things that appear not also mentioned, since the things that we do not comprehend with human reason we persuade ourselves by faith alone to be credible and true."[1] God was the "incomprehensible Object" par excellance. Augustine had said as much.[2] But Hugh drew his inspiration at this point from the pseudo-Dionysius and the latter's doctrine of "negative theology." In the Commentary on the Celestial Hierarchies, Hugh included a lengthy consideration of the impossibility of knowing God.[3] A portion was included in De sacramentis christianae fidei. He argued:

> Therefore, God can be believed, by no means can He be comprehended. You say to me: "What shall I say? What is God?" I reply to you that what God is is quite ineffable. "At least," you say, "what shall I think when I wish to think what God is?" I say furthur that God is unthinkable. Whatever is said or is thought, is said according to something. For what cannot be said or thought according to something cannot be said and thought at all. What, therefore, will you say or will you think, when you wish to say or to think that which is God? If you think of earth, if you think of heaven, if you think of all that is in heaven and on earth, none

---

[1] DS., I, x, 2, MPL 176:327D, Def., p. 165f.

[2] "The limitations of our knowledge about God--the inability to comprehend His nature and to talk about it in human language--is one of the favorite themes of the great doctor." Portalie, Guide, p. 127.

[3] Cf. Lib. III, MPL 175:973ff. The most recent study of this is Baron, Etudes, pp. 184ff. Cf. also the important study of Roques, "Conaissance de Dieu." On the place of IHC in Hugh's thought, cf. the articles by Weisweiller, "Die Ps.-Dionysiuskommentare," "Sacramentum fidei," and "Sakrament und Teilhabe."

> of these is God. Finally, if you think of spirit, if you think of soul, this is not God. "I know," you say, "that this is not God, yet this is like God, and God can be demonstrated by His likeness."
>
> See what similar thing you would show, if you should wish to demonstrate the spirit and the body, of what nature this likeness would be, and yet farther apart are God and spirit than spirit and body. For all things that are created are less distant from each other than He who made is from that which He made. What God is cannot be thought, even if it can be believed that He is, nor can it be comprehended of what nature He is. "What," said the Apostle, "eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man," (Cf. 1 Cor. 2,9); this is what we wish to say, if, however, we can say what we cannot think. "What eye hath not seen nor ear heard," because it is not perceived by sense. "Neither hath it entered into the heart of man," since it is not comprehended by thought.[1]

Following this, Hugh introduced the scheme of the three eyes and the effect of sin upon these eyes. The weakness of the eye of reason and, particularly, the blindness of the eye of contemplation necessitate the existence of faith:

> Faith, then, is necessary by which these things may be believed which are not seen, and those things which are not yet present to us through species may subsist in us through faith. And so the substance of those things is faith, since through faith alone they now subsist in us, . . .[2]

Having pointed to the need for faith, Hugh returned again to the matter of defining faith. He was not content to rest with the definition drawn from the Letter to the Hebrews. That definition, Hugh noted, failed to describe what faith is. It dealt with what faith does. Nor did it take account of that faith which is held with respect to matters in the present or in the past. Faith has to do with more than the future. Consequently, Hugh introduced his famed "full and general definition of faith." According to this,

> Faith is a kind of certainty (_certitudinem_ _quamdam_) of the mind in things absent, established beyond opinion (_supra_ _opinionem_)

---

[1] _DS_, I, x, 2, MPL 176:329AB, Def., pp. 166f.

[2] _Ibid._, 330A, p. 167.

and short of knowledge (*infra scientiam*).[1]

By opposing the certitude of faith to both *opinio* and *scientia* in defining faith, Hugh apparently meant to criticize Abelard's definition of faith, if only implicitly.[2] Like Bernard of Clairvaux and William of St. Thierry, Hugh would seem to have identified Abelard's *existimatio* with *opinio*.[3] Abelard had used the former term to define faith as "*existimatio* of [things] not apparent, . . ."[4] Bernard and William took this occasion among others to attack Abelard.[5] Recent studies have shown, however, that Abelard did not intend to use existimatio in the sense of opinio.[1] He was seeking a word to indicate knowledge concerning things absent, as opposed to the knowledge which one has of things which are present, and he found the necessary distinction in the contrast of existimatio and scientia.[2]

---

[1] *DS*, I, x, 2, MPL 176:330C, Def., p. 168. Cf. Baron, "Le 'sacrement de la foi'," pp. 51ff., for an analysis of Hugh's position as reflected in the definition.

[2] "Hugh was content to formulate his doctrine of faith at variance with the Abelardian doctrine, which was charged, despite the intentions of its author, with a dangerous equivocation." Baron, "Le 'sacrement de la foi' selon Hugues de Saint-Victor," *RSPT*, X.II (1958), 50-78. For a definitive survey of the succession of writings in which Hugh treated faith, cf. van den Eynde, *Essai*, pp. 130-42. Cf. M.-D. Chenu, "La psychologie de la foi dans la théologie du XIII^{e} siècle," *Etudes d'histoire litteraire et doctrinale du XIII^{e} siècle*. Deuxieme serie (Paris, 1932), pp. 163-87.

[3] Cf. *DS*, I, x, 2, MPL 176:330CD, Def., p. 168: "Others in those things which they hear select one side whatever for consideration (*ad existimationem*) but they do not approve for affirmation. For although they believe one of the two as more probable, yet they do not presume to assert whether it itself is still true. These are the conjecturers (*Hic sunt opinantes*)."

[4] *Introductio ad theologiam*, I, i, MPL 178:981C; cf. II, iii, 1051D: "Fides quipe dicitur existimatio non apparentium, cognitio vero ipsarum rerum experientia per ipsam eorum praesentiam." On Abelard's definition of faith, cf. Paré, *et al*, *La renaissance*, pp. 299f.; Grabmann, *GSM*, I, 188ff.; Forest, *et al*, *Le mouvement doctrinal*, pp. 97ff.; and Baron, "Le 'sacrement de la foi'," pp. 51ff. with excellent philological notes. Also, cf. J. Cottiaux, "La conception de la theologie chez Abelard," *RHE*, XXVIII (1932), 247-95, 533-51, 788-828, esp. pp. 533ff. on faith. Cf. the study of Abelard by J. G. Sykes, *Peter Abailard* (Cambridge, 1932).

[5] Cf. Sykes, *Peter Abailard*, pp. 36-40 for a further discussion of the conflict involving the three men. For Bernard's attitude toward Abelard on faith, cf. *Tract. in error. Abael.*, IV, MPL 183:1061. Cf., also, William of St. Thierry, *Disput. adv. Abael.*, I, MPL 180:249.

In the intention to distinguish clearly two kinds of knowledge and to associate knowledge of things absent with faith, Hugh and Abelard were agreed. Unfortunately, Abelard made a very poor choice of words and was even more poorly interpreted by his critics.

In differentiating faith from opinion (opinio) Hugh meant to point out the aspect of certitude as the critical concept. Faith has no place for doubt, for faith is firm and sure: "When there is still doubt, there is no faith."[3] The stability, assurance, and firmness of faith were stressed repeatedly in the treatises on the Ark.

On the other hand, Hugh distinguished the certitude of faith from knowledge (scientia). Here scientia meant the knowledge which one possesses through the presence of the object of which he has knowledge.[4] In the beginning man had certain knowledge of God through the presence of God by inward contemplation. The first man knew God in a direct sense, however difficult this might be to explicate. This was what Hugh meant by the eye of contemplation. The need for faith arises from the loss of this inner contemplative experience, for in this loss man lost the experience of God as present to him.

---

[1] Cf. the works of Cottiaux, Paré, and Baron, cited supra, p. 237, n. 4.

[2] "Scientia est de apparentibus, existimatio de non apparentibus." Cited by Paré, et al, La renaissance, p. 300.

[3] DS, I, x, 2, MPL 176:330D, Def., p. 168.

[4] Cf. Grabmann, GSM, II, 266-70.

Hugh distinguished two constituent elements in faith: Cognition (cognitio) and affection (affectio) or constancy and firmness in believing.[1] Affection was considered to be "faith itself" and the "substance of faith." Cognition was defined as "that which is believed by faith" and the "matter of faith."

> Therefore, faith has substance in affection because affection itself is faith; it has matter in cognition since faith is regarding that and unto that which is in cognition. To believe, therefore, is in affection but what is believed is in cognition.[2]

The cognitive dimension of faith has to do with knowledge, but it is derived knowledge. It is founded neither on the immediate experience of man nor upon necessary conclusions of logical arguments. Faith is "received from hearing only and is made manifest from the significance of words."[3] This meant that for Hugh the cognition of faith was simply the comprehension of statements which were made.[4]

A man can have cognition without belief, and this is precisely the case with the man who hears and understands what he is being told, but does not believe it, i.e. he lacks affection. Hugh had little good to say about such men, for he perceived very well how easy it is to "know" something and yet fail to act upon the basis of that knowledge.

---

1. Cf. DS, I, x, 3, MPL 176:331B-332B, Def., pp. 169f.

2. Ibid., 331B, p. 169.

3. Ibid., 331C.

4. Baron distinguishes cognitio as the objective aspect of faith, and affectio as the subjective; cf. Sci. et Sg., p. 28, n. 119. Baron continues by identifying the objective element with the "faith of the Church" found in the scriptures, councils, fathers, and universal belief.

> What good does it do them to have faith, and not abide therein? What does it profit them to have a sound ship, and I will not say merely to suffer shipwreck in the waves, but actually to bring the wreck about? What is the use of knowing the truth and loving what is false?[1]

If there can be knowledge without belief, the converse does not hold. There can be no belief without a certain basic understanding of that which one believes.

> Now there can be cognition of this without any faith but faith without any cognition cannot be, since he who hears and understands something does not always believe, but he who understands nothing believes nothing.[2]

In this way Hugh distinguished between the intellectual and volitional elements in the act of faith. Both, he maintained, were necessary for the act of believing.

Taking account of the various states of mankind, Hugh admitted degrees of cognition and of affection in faith. All men do not possess the same degree of knowledge in relationship to their faith, nor do they have the same degree of adherence and devotion to that which they understand.

> The faith of certain men is great by cognition, small by affection, but of certain others great by affection, small by cognition. Some have great faith both by cognition and by affection; other small both by cognition and by affection.[3]

In the final analysis, Hugh held that greater affection is more praiseworthy than greater cognition.

On the basis of cognition, Hugh constructed an hierarchically ordered series of three kinds of believers, in addition to an obvious fourth, the non-believer.[1] First there were men who believed by piety alone what they did not fully comprehend by reason. Elsewhere Hugh called such men as "the simple minded in Holy Church who believe in the more perfect believers and knowers, . . ."[2] What they lack in knowledge on their part they make up for with their firm adherence to the same beliefs as the "more perfect." Second were men who began to apply reason to the matters of faith: "Others approve (approbant) by reason what they believe by faith."[3] Again, the Augustinian motif returns. Finally, there were men who "by purity of heart and by pure conscience within already begin to sense what they believe by faith."[4] Here we move toward the termination of faith and the inception of the contemplative experience for which man longs. But the need for faith is never removed. The pure of heart who begin to sense within themselves the truth receive only an adumbration of the truth and the vision which they now possess only in the act of faith.

---

[1] A. morl., IV, 14, MPL 176:674C, Sq., p. 142.

[2] DS, I, x, 3, MPL 176:331D, Def., p. 169.

[3] Ibid., 4, 332B, p. 170.

> Thus a clean conscience is instructed and made certain daily about its God by invisible proofs and by secret and familiar visitation to such a degree that already in a manner it begins to possess Him present through contemplation, . . . and by no reason now can he be torn away from his faith and love, even if the entire world be turned into miracles.[5]

In the midst of Hugh's doctrinal summa we find the penetration of the contemplative spirit which found particularly clear expression in the Ark treatises and the other works on the mystic life.

---

[1] Cf. DS, I, x, 4, MPL 176:332D-333D. Three kinds of believers are also distinguished at two places in A. morl., cf. III, 4 and IV, 14, MPL 176:649A-651C and 674, Sq., pp. 97ff. and 141f.

[2] DS, I, x, 3, MPL 176:331D, Def., p. 169.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] DS, I, x, 4, MPL 176:333C, Def., p. 171.

In defining faith Hugh sought a broad definition, one which was not limited by the inclusion of the object of the act of faith. His definition applied equally to historical events and contemporary facts for which the evidence had to be obtained indirectly. Indeed, in speaking of the human experience known as faith, according to Hugh's definition, it is fair to say that all men have faith, although the elements of cognition may differ widely.

> It is manifest that even infidels do not live without faith for the reason that just as every man living in this life has certain things which he perceives through experience, so too he has certain things which, neither seen nor experienced, he believes by faith alone.[1]

The Ark treatises, centering upon the search for stability via the discipline of the contemplative life, gave the affective aspect of faith primary attention. The interrelationship of cognitio and affectio did not receive the subtle development which marked the section on faith in De sacramentis christianae fidei. Instead, the inquiries about faith provoked reflection upon the function of faith as a point of stability. Just as the primal contemplative experience provided the point of stability for the first man, now in the state of fallen existence faith serves the same function of stability.

The primarily affective role of faith is indicated by the fact that

---

1. Ibid., 5, 333D, pp. 171f. Vernet has criticized Hugh's definition of faith as "imperfect, because it refers to faith in general and not to theological faith." Cf. "Hugues de Saint-Victor," col. 273. To us it seems that the merit of Hugh's definition lies in the fact that he analyzed the psychological conditions of faith and then related this analysis to the specific faith possessed by Christians. Again, we see the tendency of the Victorine school to show a strong bent toward psychology. Cf. de Wulf, History, I, 213: "Psychology was his [Hugh's] favourite study, . . ."

Hugh contrasts the indwelling of faith and concupiscence in the heart of man.[1] In De substantia dilectionis the contrast was drawn between love and concupiscence, using the same ideas.[2] Love and faith both actively seek after the heavenly things of God, despising the transitory goods which abound around man in this world. Concupiscence on the other hand, is an attachment to and seeking after the goods apparent in this finite existence. All three are desire; they are love; but two are attachment, seeking for, longing for eternal things and the eternal One, while the third is an attachment, a seeking for, a longing after the temporal joys of the world, joys which are limited and which pass away.

In schematic fashion, a familiar device in Hugh's writings, our Victorine set out to describe three types of men. They were men of no faith, weak faith, and full faith.[3] They were also described as men who have a flood within them, but no ark; men with a flood and an ark of which they do not avail themselves; and men who have a flood, but dwell within the ark which preserves them from the flood.[4] The ark of which Hugh spoke was the ark of faith.

> Men of no faith are those who, do not know God, or believe the gospel of Christ, who think that there is no life beyond this one that we now have in time.[5]

This kind of man has true knowledge neither of himself nor of the world in which he lives:

---

[1] Cf. A. morl., IV, 13, MPL 176:673AD, Sq., pp. 139f.

[2] Cf. the trans., Sq., pp. 187ff.

[3] A. morl., IV, 14, MPL 176:674AD, Sq., pp. 143f.

[4] Ibid., III, 4, MPL 176:649A, Sq., pp. 97-101.

[5] Ibid., 649AB, p. 97; cf. IV, 14, 674A, p. 141: "Who are entangled in their lusts and do not know that there is any life except this transitory one."

> (He) does not know what he was made for, thinks that nothing exists beyond what he can see, does not forsee the evils that await him, and loves these transient and spurious goods as though they were to last for evermore.[1]

In contrast to the man with no faith the man with weak faith has "through faith learnt already to believe that an unchanging life will supervene upon the finish of this changing one, . . ."[2] In other words, he has some perspective on the relative values of life and of the ultimate dimensions of existence.[3] But he remains unmoved by this knowledge: "Putting the thought of that behind them, (they) give their souls over to the delight of temporal things."[4] These men have the raw material of the faith which leads to stability, i.e. to the building of the ark in the heart of man. But they lack the necessary character of affection.

Hugh introduced here a line of thought which is instructive in showing the development of the idea of "dwelling" in terms of the inner attitude of man--the line of thought which led to the fundamental assertion that the Ark of wisdom is built out of a man's thoughts. Citing Matthew 6:21, "where your treasure is, there will your heart be also," Hugh reasoned:

> Where your desire is, there also is your heart. Where your delight is, there also is your thought; and where your thought is, there is the dwelling of the inner man. For according to the inner man, everyone is said to dwell

---

[1] A. morl., III, 4, MPL 176:649B, Sq., pp. 97ff.

[2] Ibid., IV, 14, 674A, p. 141. This assumes that the men who fail to inhabit the ark they possess may be equated with men of weak faith. The contexts justify this.

[3] These men have inferred from "certain things that exist in the world . . . that God exists and has a care for the affairs of men, . . ." Ibid., III, 4, 649D, p. 98.

[4] Ibid., IV, 14, 674A, p. 141.

in that place where he dwells in thought.[1]

The men of weak faith fail to give attention to those thoughts which form the ground of true stability and instead give their minds over to the consideration of and attachment to the world, which is finite, mutable, and thus unstable. They dwell in the world.

These men of weak faith were the equivalent of the "men of opinion" mentioned earlier. They halt "between two opinions still, neither completely gainsaying nor yet entirely accepting that which is said in Holy Writ about the rewards that await the good, or the pains in store for the bad."[2] They lack conviction and certitude. Their opinion is swayed by events which they see around them, and they conclude the world could never be governed by God's providence. For a while they may believe with a seeming firm conviction. But "they equally easily fall away from their belief in the truth in time of trial, since in temptation they are readily persuaded of its falsehood."[3] Their affection, and finally their love, is directed not to God but toward the world with the result that they become like that which they love: Unstable and uncertain in all that they do.

In contrast to the foregoing were the men full of faith.[4] Their lives were marked by stability and steadfastness. Their mind and affections are turned inward and upward, to matters of the spirit. Through faith and love these men are "rooted and grounded in God." Here, at this apex of the schematic of faith, we meet with the two motifs which radically characterize the spiritual quest of Hugh of St. Victor. The first is that of inwardness; the second, that of ascension toward God. Both are inextricably intertwined, for it is through the inner man, through the soul, that man has the hope of finding God. The ascension toward God is an increasing interiorization of human consciousness and life. It does not mean an escape from the world in the sense of absolute flight. Hugh was too thoroughly committed to the "openness" of the life of a canon regular to admit that. But there must be a true inward flight of the mind from an attachment to the world to an attachment to God; from amor mundi to amor Dei. Insofar as the weakness of man necessitates his removal from the common course of life in the world and recourse to a disciplined and ordered life to achieve this end, Hugh would advise a man to seek the monastic or canonical life as a means to a higher end, the only end worth seeking at all.[1]

---

[1] A. morl., IV, 14, MPL 176:674B, Sq. p. 141. The English translation was made from a text differing from that of Migne and Mierow's collated text as well. The Migne text does not contain the following: "Where your desire is, there also is your heart."

[2] Ibid., III, 4, 649D, p. 98.

[3] Ibid., 650C, p. 99.

[4] Ibid., III, 4 and IV, 14, 650D-651A and 674D, Sq., pp. 100 and 142.

Thus far our concern has been directed toward what may be called the psychology of faith. Now we must turn to Hugh's ideas connected with the cognition of faith. What, precisely, did he consider to be content of faith?

Hugh defined the content of faith in terms of the major architectonic principle of his theological endeavor: The idea of the two divine works, the work of creation and the work of restoration. True faith embraces belief in the Creator and the Saviour and in the things which properly pertain to each.[2] Associated with the creator is primarily the creation of the world ex

---

[1] For these themes, cf., e.g., ibid., IV, 12 and 17, 672D-673A and 675D-677A, pp. 138f. and 144ff. Cf. the following chapter for further development.

[2] Cf. the development of this in DS, I, x, 5, MPL 176:333D-334, Def., pp. 171-73: "On those things which pertain to faith."

nihilo in six days. With the Saviour are preeminently to be associated those things concerning the restoration of man in the six ages of history from Creation to Consummation. Thus the six days of creation are juxtaposed to the six ages of history.

In _De sacramentis_ Hugh stressed several aspects of this content.[1] First, it is necessary to make the proper distinction between the Creator and his creation. Hugh completely rejected any notions of pantheism. Secondly, creation must be distinguished from the works of redemption. Those things made to serve man in the beginning in the perfection of the created order are far different from those things by which he is now restored to spiritual health. Finally, while making these distinctions, it is absolutely necessary to remain aware that it is one God who is both Creator and Saviour. Creation and restoration are acts of the one God who reveals himself to man in the mystery of the Trinity.

The philosophers of the pagans, Hugh asserted, manage to distinguish properly between the Creator and the creation.[2] But they fail to honor the Saviour, and what is worse, they "cut the unity of the Godhead into many parts." The Jews, on the other hand, confess God the Creator as One but fail to recognize the Saviour. The faithful Christian alone will give the proper balance to his piety, for he rightly distinguishes Creator and creation and venerates both Creator and Saviour along with the things connected with each.

When comparing the works of restoration with the works of creation, Hugh spoke of the six ages which the former require in contrast to the six days for the latter. Both continuity and discontinuity were established in this way. The parallel of sixes implicitly stressed the continuity in the two works. Just as God took six periods of time to create man, so he has chosen to take six periods of time in which to effect the restoration of mankind. It was the same God acting in both works. When Hugh considered the length of the periods, he saw the discontinuity. The works of restoration, being far nobler than the works of creation, must take a far longer time to be accomplished. It is one thing to give things existence; it is another to give better being to those things which have been impaired by sin.[1]

---

[1] _DS_, I, x, 5, MPL 176:333D-334, Def., pp. 171-73.

[2] Cf. _DS_, I, x, 5, MPL 176:334D, Def., p. 172. For the remaining portion of this chapter, cf. _ibid._, 4, 333BC, p. 171.

The work of creation comprised the sum total of the activity of God in giving existence to all beings, which were created _ex nihilo_.[2] This work was accomplished in the six days narrated in the opening chapter of Genesis. We have already observed that Hugh viewed the creative activity of God as having temporal extension. This contrasted with the Augustinian view that the six days recorded in Genesis were to be understood only as allegory. Again we see the Victorine emphasis upon the temporal dimension of the divine activity. And inherent in this viewpoint was the assumption that this temporal extension was for the benefit of mankind. God was free to create as he wished; he carried it out in the manner he did in order to instruct man.[3]

---

[1] Cf. _DS_, I, prol., ii, MPL 176:183A-184A, Def., pp. 3f.

[2] "The work of foundation is that whereby those things which were not came into being . . . . the creation of the world with all its elements." _Ibid._, 183B, p. 3. Cf. _A. morl._, IV, 6, MPL 176:667B, Sq., p. 128. Deferrari translates _conditio_ "foundation;" we translate it "creation."

[3] "Provided we believe without question that he could also have done otherwise, if the plan of the Omnipotent Will had so demanded." _DS_, I, i, 3, MPL 176:188C, Def., p. 9. Hugh expressed the same conception of divine freedom with respect to the mode of man's restoration. Cf. _A. morl._, IV, 5 and 6, MPL 176:666C and 667D, Sq., pp. 127 and 129.

The narrative of creation was not only an historical narrative; it was also a sacramentum, a mystery upon which the faithful were intended to meditate.[1] What is the mystery enclosed within the succession of events in the creation? Nothing less than the nature of man's estrangement from God and the divine plan whereby man is to be restored to a state of interior unity so that he may again enjoy the rapport of the knowledge and love of God possessed by the first man.

The works of creation were intended to benefit man. From the Hugonian point of view man was the cause for the creation of the world, insofar as the world had been created to provide for man's proper needs.[1] Man was created as the "possessor and Lord of the world . . . by right of his foundation."[2] The cause for the creation of man lay in the eternal goodness of God. Necessity was not the cause of creation. The cause was divine goodness, wishing to share His beatitude.

---

[1] Cf. esp. DS, I, i, 12, MPL 176:195C-197B, Def., pp. 16ff: "The sacrament of the divine works." The chapter commences: "I think that here a great sacrament (magnum sacramentum) is commended, . . ." Sacramentum was a polyvalent term in Hugh's writings, as in previous writers generally. In a wider sense, as here, the word meant "mystery," "hidden meaning," or "symbolic sense." Hugh also used sacramentum to designate the great typological events of the Old Testament; cf. DS, II, vi, 8, MPL 176:454Cff., Def., pp. 295ff. and A. morl., IV, 19, MPL 176:679AB, Sq., p. 150. The word was also employed in a narrower sense of sign, converging upon the liturgical sacraments of the church. Sacramentum could mean "sign of a sacred thing," or one of the specific sacraments under the natural law, written law, or grace. The sacraments of grace included the seven sacraments later accepted as normative along with the subclass of sacramental actions later classified as "sacramentals." Hugh introduced his famous definition of "a sacrament proper" (sacramentum proprie) in DS, I, ix, 2, MPL 176:317D, Def., p. 155: "A sacrament is a corporeal or material element set before the senses without, representing by similitude and signifying by institution and containing by sanctification some invisible and spiritual grace." For Hugh's use of the word sacramentum, cf. Baron, Sci. et Sg., pp. 222f. and n. 11, and "Hughes de Saint-Victor lexicographe," Cultura Neolatina, XVI (1956), p. 112. Very important for Hugh's sacramental thought is Weisweiller, Wirksamkeit, and "Sakrament und Teilhabe." Cf. also the recent article by H. R. Schlette, "Die Eucharistielehre Hugos von St. Viktor," ZKTh, LXXXI (1959), 67-100, 163-210. Weisweiller and Schlette have shown the indebtedness of Hugh to both Augustine and pseudo-Dionysius in his sacramental theology. On Augustine, cf. C. Coutrier, "Sacramentum et Mysterium dans l'oeuvre de saint Augustin," Études Augustiennes ("Théologie," Vol. XXVIII; Paris, 1953), pp. 163-274. Coutrier finds three usages of sacramentum: Rite, symbol, and mystery. On the place of sacraments in Dionysian thought, cf. Roques, L'Univers Dionysien, pp. 245-302, and Rutledge, Cosmic Theology, passim.

> From this, then, did the foundation of the rational creature take its first cause, because God in His eternal goodness wished that there be made sharers in His blessedness, . . . That good, . . . was induced by goodness alone, not by necessity, to communicate itself, . . .[3]

The works were also intended to function as a mode of divine revelation. This has already been touched upon in connection with the knowledge of God. In the beginning the fabric of the universe was like a "book" or a "spoken, external word of God."[4] Viewed rightly and understood as the symbol of an higher reality the visible world was capable of leading man to a knowledge of the invisible world of spiritual realities and of God. The world was, as we have noted in connection with the creation narrative, a sacramentum. Per visibilia ad invisibilia.[5] This idea was at the center of Hugh's thought in connection with the works of creation and the works of restoration.

The conception of the fabric of the entire universe as a sign or symbol of invisible realities was a major theme of Hugh's commentary on Dionysius' Celestial Hierarchies. This attitude is summed up well in a passage drawn from the ninth book of In hierarchiam:

---

[1] Cf. A. morl., IV, 6 and 11, MPL 176:667A and 672A, Sq., pp. 128 and 137; also DS, I, ii, 1, MPL 176:205B-206D, Def., pp. 28f.

[2] DS, I, ii, 1, MPL 176:205B, Def., p. 28.

[3] Ibid., 4, 208A, p. 31.

[4] Major themes in A. morl., cf. II, 12ff., MPL 176:643Bff., Sq., pp. 87ff. Cf. also DS, I, iii, 20 and vi, 5, MPL 176:225AB and 267B-268B, Def., pp. 50 and 97.

[5] Cf. the illuminating remarks by Schlette in Nichtigkeit, pp. 128-35.

> The creature reveals the artisan, and the beauty of the admirable works commends the splendor of the author. Goodness is one and beauty is one, and goodness itself is beauty itself. Supreme good and supreme beauty, and in the supreme good all good, one good, and in the supreme beauty, all beauty, one beauty . . . . many goods were made by God, in order to disclose the one supreme good; and in a similar fashion, many beautiful things were made and they represent (demonstro) the image of the one supreme beauty.[1]

Here we see Hugh moving within the bounds of the idea of the "participation" which formed so prominent a feature of the Dionysian world view.[2] Goodness and beauty in the world are such because the world participates in the Goodness and Beauty of God. Conversely, the world thus points beyond itself to the ultimate source of Goodness and Beauty. The world in its many facets is visible--but partial--symbol of the invisible. The idea of participation was absorbed by Hugh into his own teaching, and the Dionysian idea of the Eucharist as participation in Christ is found in Hugh's discussion of the Eucharist in De sacramentis christianae fidei.[3]

Hugh advised the readers of De arca Noe mystica that if they wished to know more fully his thoughts on the knowledge of God which man can gain from the created order they ought to consult his tractate, De tribus diebus.[1] In that work Hugh sought to indicate the numerous manifestations of the trinitarian God in the structure of the created world.[2] He compared the world to a book:

---

[1] MPL 175:1118CD. Cf. Baron, Sci. et Sg., pp. 181f. He has also pointed out that the use of demonstro in this and other contexts by Hugh of St. Victor is the equivalent of the word ostensio. It meant not a logical deduction, but rather a manifestation, a showing forth. Cf. ibid., pp. 24f.

[2] Cf. the very important works of Weisweiller and Roques noted just above, p. 249, n. 1. The excellent section on Dionysius, in Chenu, TDS, pp. 129-134, offers particularly valuable insights on the ideas of participation and hierarchy; cf. also chap. VII, "La mentalite symbolique."

[3] Cf. infra on the sacraments.

> The universe of the sensible world is like a book written by the finger of God, i.e. created by divine power. Individual creatures are like figures intended to manifest the wisdom of the invisible God; not figures invented by the consent of humans but instituted by the divine will.[3]

The immensity of the world demonstrated the divine power; its beauty, His wisdom; its utility, His goodness.[4] In consonance with Trinitarian thought of his age, Hugh associated power with the Father, wisdom with the Son, and goodness with the Holy Spirit.[5]

In the moral treatise on the Ark this same conception was worked out in terms of the motifs of "Book" and "Word." The emphasis upon the manifestation of the Trinity was less. The thrust of the Ark treatise was to show the fundamental relationship between God, man, and the world and between that which is unchanging and that which always changes.

---

[1] A. myst., VII, MPL 176:693D. De tribus diebus is found in the Migne edition of Hugh's works as the seventh book of the Didascalicon, cf. 176: 811ff. De tribus diebus appears as a separate work in the Indiculum of Hugh's works published by Ghellinck, "La table des matieres," p. 281, no. 35, and pp. 391f. Cf. also Hauréau, Les Oeuvres, pp. 98-101.

[2] The idea of the vestiga Dei which manifest the trinitarian nature of God in the structure of the world was given classical expression by Augustine. For a summary of the vestiges, cf. Portalie, Guide, pp. 134f.

[3] Chap. III, MPL 176:814B.

[4] Ibid., I, 811C-812C. Cf. A. myst., VII, MPL 176:693D.

[5] De tribus diebus, XXVII, MPL 176:838C. Cf. DS, I, ii, 26-29, MPL 176:227C-231C, Def., pp. 53-57. Much of this chapter of DS was condensed from De tribus diebus. On the priority, cf. van den Eynde, Essai, pp. 65ff. On the Trinitarian thought of the twelfth century, with special emphasis upon Hugh of St. Victor, cf. Johann Hofmeier, Die Trinitätslehre des Hugo von St. Viktor; dargestellt im Zusammenhang mit den trinitarischen Strömungen seiner Zeit ("Münchener Theologische Studien," II. Syst. abt., Bd. 25; München, 1963). Van den Eynde, pp. 68f., indicates Hugh was indebted to Abelard for the triad power-wisdom-goodness.

Moving in the triadic structure to which we have seen him so accustomed, Hugh outlined the relationship between three books and between three words.[1] The first book was the book written by man and made by human craft out of material. The second book was the world which God has created out of nothing. The third book was the Wisdom of God, begotten by God from Himself, God of God.[2]

The three words were patterned on a similar scheme.[3] The first word, Hugh said, was the word which is spoken by man. The second word Hugh called the "external" word of God. This word which God has uttered is the world which God has created. The third word is the "internal" Word of God, the Wisdom of God, the uncreated, eternal, and immutable Word.

The contrast which Hugh wished to draw was clearly lined in each of the triads. The human book, like the human word, is something which perishes. It is marked by mutability, transiency, and death.

> The books that men write are made of the skins of dead animals or some other corruptible material, and, as these last for only a short time, the books themselves grow old and in their own way are reduced to nothing, leaving no vestige of themselves behind.[4]

These books in and of themselves are incapable of bestowing enduring life upon those men who read them. Books and men are mortal. Man's word is the same: It ceases to exist when it is uttered.

---

[1] Cf. _A. morl._, II, 12f., MPL 176:643B-646A, Sq., pp. 87-92.

[2] _Ibid._, 12, 643D, p. 88.

[3] _Ibid._, 12 and 13, 644A and 645BC, pp. 89 and 91.

[4] _Ibid._, 12, 643CD, p. 88.

There is another book, or word, which does not cease to exist, although it is marked by mutability. This is the world which God has created.[1] This world was intended to function as a book or word which reveals something of the author. Just as the word of man when spoken gives outward expression to the inner thoughts of the human heart, so the world, the "external word" of God, gives voice to His power and His wisdom.

> And as the heart's thought is known through the utterance of the voice, so is the wisdom of God manifested in His work.[2]

The idea of the book, as expressed in De tribus diebus, was present in the Ark treatise:

> The second is the work of God which never ceases to exist, in which visible work is written visibly the invisible wisdom of the Creator.[3]

The third book and word of which Hugh spoke was the Wisdom of God, the Word of God, the second Person of the Trinity. In contrast to the "external" word of the created world, this third word of God was God's "internal" word. It was also immutable and eternal, in contrast to the changing finite world of temporal reality.

With the Fall of man, the works of creation no longer served human needs. For now the chief needs of man were not those for which the created order had been meant to provide. Man was now sick, and as Hugh said,

---

[1] A. morl., 12 and 13, MPL 176:643D and 645BC, Sq., pp. 89 and 91.

[2] Ibid., 13, 645B, p. 91. Cf. DS, I, iii, 20, MPL 176:225AB, Def., p. 50; also Did., VI, 5, Butt., p. 123, Tay., p. 145: "Every nature tells of God; every nature teaches man."

[3] A. morl., 12, MPL 176:643D, Sq., p. 88.

> the world could keep a man in health, but it could not make a sick man better. Therefore, after that first creation of the things that were to minister to those who stood, it was necessary to make others which should raise the fallen.[1]

Man's sickness was reflected in his perception of the world. No longer was the world like a book, revealing the power, wisdom, and goodness of the Creator. It was the same world; the same order and structure prevailed; but man's ability to perceive the inner meaning of things and events was lost. Fallen man had become like an illiterate individual who, when placed before an open book, was able to see the letters and the illuminations but was incapable of understanding the meaning of the letters. He could appreciate the shapes and colors of figures; but it was quite another matter to understand the sense and the signification of the letters.[2]

It was similar in the case of time. Originally time was ordered toward a transcendental end. With the eruption of sin, this order was broken and from the human point of view time assumed a new appearance. Again, man's perception and not time itself changed. The problem lay with man's disordered and disoriented state of being. Already we have seen Hugh's moving account of this new "face" of time. At best it could be called an endless cycle of birth and death. The only continuity came from the fact that there were others who would follow the same cycle.

The word "chaos" was the most frequent term used in the Ark treatises to describe this state of affairs. The symbol of the flood evoked this chaos. Appropriately the flood symbolized not only the external chaos of events, but the internal chaos of man's disordered desires as well.[1]

---

[1] A. morl., IV, 11, MPL 176:672A, Sq., p. 137.

[2] Cf. De tribus diebus, III, MPL 176:814C.

In the midst of this chaotic and confused time, in a world become opaque to spiritual reality, Hugh discerned a new stability and a new divine presence emerging--even from the very beginning. This new stability and this new presence were to be found in the works of restoration, the divine activity in the world seeking to restore man and bring him again to his intended goal and to the fruition of his desire for the ultimate good.

Hugh's conception of the work of restoration was a faithful reflection of Augustine's statement that,

> the divine providence accomplished in time the salvation of mankind, by reforming and regenerating it for eternal life.[2]

The work of restoration had begun with the onset of man's need to be restored. There has never been a time in the history of the world when man has not had the means whereby he might return to God: "As long as there is sickness there is time for remedy."[3] In all ages there have been faithful men, making their pilgrimage toward the heavenly Jerusalem: "We believe that there is no time from the beginning of the world until the end of the same in which men faithful to Christ have not been found."[4]

The divine purpose to recall man and to restore him had its focal point in a single historical event, the Incarnation of the Word. It is to this event that all other deeds and actions connected with the restoration of mankind either look forward in anticipation or look backward in recollection and remembrance.

---

[1] More will be said about this theme in the next chapter. For typical statements, cf. A. morl., IV, 15 and 16, MPL 176:674D-675D, Sq., pp. 142-144. Cf. also Quid vere diligendum sit, II and III, edited as part of De substantia dilectionis by Baron in "Rapports," pp. 428f.; a French trans. is in Baron, Textes spirituels, pp. 41f. The flood theme is very prominent.

[2] De vera religione, VII, 13, MPL 34:128. Cf. the comments in Petry, "Three medieval chroniclers," pp. 282f., and Chenu, TDS, p. 67. Cf. Augustine's De catechizandis rudibus and De civitate Dei for the development of this historical perspective.

[3] DS, I, viii, 12, MPL 176:313D, Def., p. 150.

[4] A. myst., III, MPL 176:685B.

> To his [man's] restoration belongs the Incarnation of the Word, and all those things which, since the beginning, preceded the Incarnation either to foreshadow or foretell it, together with those that came after it until the end of the world, with a view to preaching or believing in it.[1]

This statement from De arca Noe morali lacks the precise usage of sacramental relationship found in all other definitions of the works of restoration. It is one indication among others that when he wrote the Ark treatises Hugh must not have developed his idea of the historical progress of efficacious sacramental actions in each of the three ages.[2] Nor apparently had he worked out his definition of the sacramentum proprie found in De sacramentis, for we find him using sacramentum in the Isidorian sense of "mystery" or "type" or for the eucharist.[3]

De sacramentis christianae fidei provides the classical summary of the definition of the works of restoration:

---

[1] A. morl., IV, 6, MPL 176:667B, Sq., p. 128.

[2] See our comments on his sacramental doctrine, infra. Already in DSNSL, MPL 176:35 the efficacy of sacraments in all ages, and not just their effect of foreshadowing, was presented.

[3] For the sense of "mystery," cf. A. myst., passim. For the typological use, cf. A. morl., IV, 19, MPL 176:678D-679B, Sq., p. 149f. The parallel with Isidorian usage is pointed out by van den Eynde, Essai, pp. 70f. and n. 124. He is of the opinion that this shows the undeveloped state of Hugh's sacramental doctrine. Cf. Isidore of Seville, Etymol., VI, 19, n. 39-42, MPL 82:255C. For identification as the eucharist, cf. A. morl., II, 14, MPL 176:646B, Sq., p. 92. Cf. our note on sacramentum, supra, p. 249, n. 1.

> The work of restoration is the Incarnation of the Word with all its sacraments, both those which have gone before and those which come after, even to the end of the world.[1]

There, too, Hugh pointed out that the works of restoration are uniquely the subject of Sacred Scripture. Secular writings are concerned with the works of creation. Just as the works of restoration are superior, so Scripture is superior to all other writings.[2]

In considering the works of restoration Hugh suggested there were three things which needed prime consideration: Time, place, and remedy. Of them he had this to say:

> The time is the present life from the beginning of the world even to the end of the world. The place is this world. The remedy consists in three things: in faith, in the sacraments, in good works.[3]

In the temporal dimension of the works of restoration Hugh found a pedagogical motif. This was true for the works in their individual as well as universal significance. In _De arca Noe morali_ Hugh introduced the idea that God determined the particular manner in which restoration occurs for the purpose of educating man. God Himself was completely free in choosing how to reintegrate man. There was no absolute necessity connected with the manner of man's restoration. This absence of necessity extended even to the Incarnation and placed Hugh in opposition to Anselm of Canterbury's intention of showing in _Cur Deus homo_ the necessary reasons for the Incarnation.[4] Speaking of the manner of man's restoration Hugh saw it as a pedagogical process:

---

[1] _DS_, I, prol., ii, MPL 176:183B, Def., p. 3.

[2] _Ibid._, 183C, p. 4. Cf. same idea in _DSSS_, II, MPL 175:11BC.

[3] _DS_, I, viii, 1, MPL 176:305D-306C, Def., p. 142.

[4] Cf. Vernet, "Hugues de Saint-Victor," col. 279 where he observes that while the "the soteriology of Hugh is of Anselmian inspiration," the Victorine canon differs from Anselm in "teaching that God could have redeemed man in a manner other than by the incarnation of the Word."

> Nothing is impossible to Almighty God, and if He so willed, He could without delay translate those upon whom He intended to have mercy straight from the toils, the difficulties, and the dangers of this present life that is so crowded with temptations, to the changelessness of the eternal life. What He does will, however, is that His chosen should go through the purgation of divers troubles and numerous trials. Thus as they return to Him by way of many sorrows, they may understand how far they had strayed from Him by sinning. For when, not as men translated but as men led back, they traverse by repentance the road along which they had gone away by sinning, they realize as it were from the daily fatigue of the journey, that they have been brought back as from afar.[1]

God has acted so that man may know both the extent of his deviation and the goodness of God.

The differential between the various periods in the historical unfolding of the works of restoration also manifested a pedagogical motif.

> Thus there is need that He [God], assume first the character of a counselor, then that of the helper, at least in such a way that He first leave man entirely to himself, in order that man himself may both experience his own ignorance and realize that he is in need of counsel, then also feel his lack and recognize that he has need of help.
>
> For such a reason, therefore, in the time of the natural law man was left entirely to himself, afterwards in the time of the written law counsel was given to him when he realized his ignorance, finally in the time of grace help was furnished him when he confessed his lack.[2]

God has undertaken to educate the aggregate of humanity through a successive series of divine initiatives in history. But there is also an individual, contemporary pedagogical motive here. Men, in reading the history of salvation, may find therein the pattern of their own return.

Zealously Hugh explored the varieties of divine initiative which marked the successive stages in the purposeful plan of man's restoration. He found them limned in the pages of Holy Writ, wherein the diverse ways of God with man were recorded.[1]

---

[1] A. morl., IV, 5, MPL 176:666CD, Sq., p. 127. Cf. ibid., I, 2, 610/20, p. 46.

[2] DS, I, viii, 3, MPL 176:307C, Def., p. 143.

In the Ark treatises the scheme for the periodization of history which emerged most clearly was that of the three periods of natural law, written law, and grace. De arca Noe mystica contained an extremely long exposition of the interrelationship between these three periods of time and the divine work of restoring mankind.[2] The grand scheme of the six ages of the world, a paradigm which paralleled the six days of creation, was used by Hugh to keynote the contrast between the work of restoration and the work of foundation.[3] However, in the iconography of the Ark and in the two treatises, the structure of the six ages was not particularly apparent.[4]

Hugh was familiar with other permutations of periods representing the divine purpose in history. De arca Noe morali made an allusion to the five ages of history which patristic exegetes had found typified in the five hours at which workers were called to the vineyard in the parable recorded

---

1. Cf. A. morl., I, 14, MPL 176:630A, Sq., p. 64: "The thirty volumes of the Holy Writ . . . wherein is contained the sum of all the things that God has done, or else is going to do, for His Church."

2. Cf. chap. V, MPL 176:688A-691B. The chapter in A. myst. is very prolix and repetitious. It was reworked, condensed, and used in DSNLS, MPL 176:32BD. The passage from this latter work was incorporated essentially intact into DS, I, viii, 11, MPL 176:312D-313C, Def., pp. 149f. Cf. van den Eynde, Essai, pp. 80ff.

3. Cf. A. morl., IV, 11, MPL 176:272A, Sq., p. 137.

4. After giving the genealogy of Christ and the succession of Popes in A. myst., Hugh went on to outline the six ages, giving the same chronology as presented in the Chronicon. Cf. A. myst., IV, MPL 176:687D-688A.

in the Gospel according to Matthew, 20:1-16.[1]

De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris summarized the multiplicity of ways in which the divine plan might be construed. None of them excluded the others; each complemented rather than dominated:

> It ought to be known that the whole series and extension of time has been divided into the following: *Two states*, the old and the new; *three times*, of the natural law, of the written law, and of grace; and *six ages* [marked by Adam, Noah, Abraham, David, the transmigration, and Christ]. Again, the five preceding ages, from Adam to Christ, may be divided into *four successions* [Patriarchs, Judges, Kings, and High Priests]. . . .[2]

Hugh explained the nature of each of the fifteen periods, but these explanations need not detain us now. But note should be taken of one comment. After noting the six ages of the world could be assimilated to the six ages of man, Hugh continued by observing:

> It ought to be noted that these ages are not divided according to equal spaces of time, but according to the universal innovations of things (*secundum communes innovationes rerum*), as by the flood, the election of Abraham, the institution of the kingship, the transmigration into Babylon, and the advent of Christ.[3]

The progressive stages in the divine economy of restoration were not meant to be established by human schemes and devices. They were established by the divine initiatives in history which marked new stages in the relationship between God and man.

---

[1] I, 19, MPL 176:678BC, Sq. pp. 148f. Cf. the exposition by Raban Maur, *Comm. in Matt.*, VI, xx, MPL 107:1025ff.; esp. col. 1026CD. Honorius of Autun symbolically paralleled the five ages of the world, the five ages of man, and five of the seven canonical hours; cf. *Gemma animae*, II, liv, MPL 172:633, cited by Pourrat, *SMA*, II, 173.

[2] Chap. XVII, MPL 175:24AC. Emphasis mine. In the opening table of the *Chronicon* we find that the four successions have been woven into the major pattern of the six ages is establishing the chronology of the works of restoration *secundum hebraicam veritatem*. Cf. MS. B. N. 15009, fols. 3^{v}-5^{r}. It is significant that Hugh broke with the general western tradition and based his post-Exilic chronology on the line of Jewish High Priests and Herodian kings rather than on the reigns of Persian, Alexandrian, and Roman rulers. The biblical-historical orientation is obvious.

[3] *DSSS*, XVII, MPL 175:24CD.

As noted earlier, the Ark treatises show little explicit concern with the sacramental life of the church narrowly conceived. Apparently Hugh had not developed his sacramental doctrine with the rich insight of his more mature years. It would be misleading to imply that the Ark treatises have no sacramental concerns. The treatises are permeated with a sacramental view of the universe and of life, as we have shown and as we shall explicate further in the next chapter. For this reason it will be useful to touch upon the essentials of Hugh's sacramental theology, but unnecessary to explore it in detail at this point.[1]

One of Hugh's major contributions was the introduction of his definition of the sacramentum proprie:

> A sacrament is a corporeal or material element set before the senses without, representing by similitude and signifying by institution and containing by sanctification some invisible and spiritual grace.[2]

Hugh took this to be a definition which applied to every sacrament and only to sacraments. The definition represents a masterful synthesis of the Augustinian idea of a sacrament as "the sign of a sacred thing," and the notion of participation derived from the writings of the pseudo-Dionysius.[3]

---

[1] The fundamental study is Weisweiller, Wirksamkeit. Cf. also Schlette, "Die Eucharistielehre," and E. Kleineidam, "Literargeschichtliche Bemerkungen zur Eucharistielehre Hugos von St. Viktor," Scholastik, XX/XXIV (1949), 564-566.

[2] DS, I, ix, 2, MPL 176:317D, Def., p. 155. For a survey of the development of sacramental thought, cf. E. F. Rogers, Peter Lombard and the Sacramental System: Also cf. Ghellinck, MT, pp. 499ff. and 533-547; idem, "Eucharistie au XIIe s. en Occident," DTC, V, 1287-93; and R. C. Petry, Christian Eschatology and Social Thought (New York, 1956), esp. chap. IX, subtitled, "Nature and Supernature; Sacraments and Liturgy."

[3] This has been masterfully expounded by Weisweiller, "Sakrament und Teilhabe," and also in "Sacramentum fidei." Cf. now the work of Schlette, "Die Eucharistielehre," pp. 193-210.

In his sacramental thought Hugh held in fruitful tension the idea of an actual historical development in the relationship of God to man, the effectualization of salvation in every age, and the uniqueness of the Incarnation as the means for man's redemption. Against those who argued that the sacraments of the periods of the natural and written law were merely symbols and shadows of a reality to come, Hugh pressed the case for the efficacy of such sacramental actions _in their time_.[1] With equal firmness he held the efficacy of all sacraments to be derived from passion of the Saviour.[2]

In line with his insistence upon the absence of logical necessity in the manner of creation and restoration, Hugh also insisted upon the non-necessity of the sacraments, from the _divine_ point of view.[3] As far as God is concerned, Hugh maintained, the sacraments are not absolutely necessary for the bestowal of health-giving grace. They have been established by dispensation and even in the sacraments Hugh found a pedagogical motif.[4] From the human perspective, however, the sacraments are absolutely necessary. They are the divinely ordained manner of establishing, or re-establishing, the bond between God and man. They are the way in which God is now _present_ to man.[5] Through baptism men are united in the Church, which is "the body of Christ vivified by one Spirit." Through the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ men are "vivified." "Through baptism we are made members of the body, but through the body of Christ we are made participants of vivification."[1] In the moral treatise on the Ark, Hugh admonishes his readers that they do not worthily partake of the eucharist if they do not perceive the inner reality of the outward sign.

---

[1] _DS_, I, xi, 1 and 2, MPL 176:343BC, Def., pp. 182f. Cf. Weisweiller, _Wirksamkeit_, chaps. 1 and 2.

[2] _DS_, I, xi, 2, MPL 176:343C, Def., pp. 182f.

[3] Cf. _DS_, I, ix, 5, MPL 176:323C-326B, Def., pp. 160-63.

[4] _Ibid._, chap. 3, 319A-322A, pp. 156-159.

[5] Cf. _IHC_, I, i, MPL 175:926D-927A: "In the _simulacra_ of grace God was revealed as present (_praesens_); . . . Divine theology chooses the works of restoration according to the humanity of Jesus and his sacraments which are from the beginning."

> It is as if Christ said: 'Do not imagine that it is enough for you to receive me bodily in the sacrament, unless you have learnt to eat Me also in My function as the word of life, enlightening souls, making sinners righteous, and quickening the dead.'[2]

The Ark treatises have little by way of explicit Christology, but much lies implicit in their pages. The massiveness of the section on the Incarnation in De sacramentis christianae fidei attests Hugh's interest in the matter.[3] Our purpose now is to point out several Christological themes which tend to predominate in the Ark treatises. The iconographical representation of Christ as Creative Word, Providential Ruler, Judge, and Contemplative Goal in the drawing of the Ark has been described. Overall in the Ark treatises, the thought of Christ as Mediator dominates, along with the theme of the true union of divinity and humanity in Christ.

While stressing the unity of Christ's person, Hugh also designated functions for the Incarnate Word according to each of his two natures.[1] In his two natures Christ is capable of providing the remedy for the basic twofold dilemma of fallen humanity. In his humanity, Jesus may be called the Book of Life, for "as man he gives us an example." In his divinity, he may be called the Tree of Life, for it is by the virtue of his divinity that He furnishes man with a remedy for his ills. This division of functions, it will be recalled, was depicted in the drawing of the Ark. The Incarnate Word is the One who is now "enlightening souls, making sinners righteous, and quickening the dead."[2]

---

[1] DS, II, ii, 1, MPL 176:416B, Def., p. 254. On union and vivification through baptism and the eucharist, cf. Schlette, "Die Eucharistielehre," pp. 182-92.

[2] A. morl., II, 14, MPL 176:646B, Sq., p. 92.

[3] Cf. II, i, MPL 176:371-416, Def., pp. 205-53. On Hugh's Christology see now Hofmeier, Die Trinitatslehre and Schlette, "Die Eucharistielehre," pp. 83-100: "Die Eucharistie als Commemoratio der Passio Christi." There is the older work by E. Poppenberg, Die Christologie des Hugo von St. Viktor (Hiltrup, 1932). Cf. also Schneider, Geschichte und Geschichtsphilosophie, chap. 3; Baron, Sci. et Sg., pp. 125-28; Lasic, Théologia perfectiva, pp. 328-38.

As the column stands in the center of the Ark, so Christ is set in the midst of his Church. This theme of "verticality" evoked the mediatorship of Christ in moving language:

> Our Lord Jesus Christ, set up in the midst of His Church for all believers alike as the reward of work, the End of the journey and the victor's crown. He it is who rose from the earth and pierced the heavens, who came down to the depths, yet did not leave the heights, who is Himself both above and below, above in His majesty, below in His compassion, above that He may draw our longings thither, below that He may offer us His help. Below He is among us, above He is above us. Below is what He took from us, above is what He sets before us.[3]

Throughout the Ark treatises the theme of unity was sounded. And the unity of the people of God is through Christ. At the center post of the Ark, He supports the whole fabric.[4] He distributes gifts of the spirit to all those who are counted among the faithful people within the body of the

---

[1] Cf., e.g., A. morl., II, 9 and 11, MPL 176:641B-642A and 642D-643B, Sq., pp. 84f. and 86f.

[2] Ibid., 14, 646B, p. 92.

[3] Ibid., 8, 640CD, p. 82.

[4] For this paragraph, cf. A. myst., II, MPL 176:684C-685A.

Church, whether they be on the first floor or have risen in the contemplative life to the third. The Church in a very real sense "leans" upon her Lord in the way the beams of the Ark lean upon the column.

Likewise the whole pattern of the history of restoration centered and pivoted about the person of Christ. The fleshly genealogy led from Adam to Christ; the line of spiritual filiation of the Popes continued the line after Christ. And the eschatological unity of the two peoples of God, in reality one people, was adumbrated by the congregation of patriarchs and apostles, gathered about the throne of the lamb as envisioned in the Apocalypse of John.

The unity of the people of God in all ages of history through the one Saviour Christ received its most powerful expression in Hugh's works by way of imagery developed posterior to the Ark treatises. In a vision of history which embraced the unity of all God's people and the continuing struggle with evil and wrong within the divine dispensation of events, Hugh spoke of Christ the King, leading his army through the ages, warring with Satan and his forces:

> For the Incarnate Word is our King, who came into this world to war with the devil; and all the saints who were before His coming are soldiers as it were, going before their King, and those who have come after and will come, even to the end of the world, are soldiers following their King. And the King himself is in the midst of His army and proceeds protected and surrounded on all sides by His columns. . . . all are really serving the one king and following the one banner; all are pursuing the one enemy and are being crowned by the one victory.[1]

Christ the King bestrides the ages bringing light and life to all the faithful through the sacraments. From beginning to end, Hugh's thought was tempered by this vision in which eschatology and history coalesce.

---

[1] DS, I, prol., ii, MPL 176:183BC, Def., p. 4; cf. ibid., I, viii, 11, 312CD, Def., p. 148. Cf. Schlette, Nichtigkeit, p. 147 and refs. there.

CHAPTER IV

History and Contemplation

In the Ark treatises Hugh's final concern was with one problem. He wanted to lead his fellow canons to an understanding of man's disturbed and disoriented state of being in the world such that they might also find the way in which this defective state of existence might be restored to some degree of peace, order, and stability. Both problem and remedy were expounded within the familiar framework of the Augustinian motif of the two loves which mark human existence.[1] Man is set between the worlds of matter and spirit. He may love God or love the world; it is either *amor Dei* or *amor mundi*. And in the act of loving, a man becomes that which he loves.[2] Hugh summed up the problem and the solution in terms of *amor mundi* and *amor Dei* in the following way:

---

[1] Cf. the study by John Burnaby, *Amor Dei. A Study of the Religion of St. Augustine* (London, 1938). Augustine presents a summary of the antithesis in *De doctrina christiana*, Lib. I. Cf. *On Christian Doctrine*, trans. John J. Gavigan, ("The Fathers of the Church," Vol. 2; New York, 1947). Cf. Schlette, *Nichtigkeit*, pp. 105ff.

[2] "The human heart [which] had kept its stability in cleaving to divine love and remained one in the love of the One, was as it were divided into as many channels as there were objects that it craved, . . ." *A. morl.*, I, 2, MPL 176:619/20, Sq. p. 47. Cf. Gilson, *Augustine*, p. 8: "In the case of love, the object loved reacts in some way on the loving subject so as to transform it into its own image and thereby assimilate it. To love material and perishable things is to be materialized and doomed to perish; to love the eternal is to become eternal; to love God is to become God." Hugh followed Augustine.

> See we have shown you these stages--the disease itself, a wavering heart, unstable and restless; the cause of the disease which is clearly love of the world (amor mundi); and the remedy of the disease which is the love of God (amor Dei). And to these must be added a fourth, namely, the application of the remedy, that is, the way in which we may attain to the love of God.[1]

The fourth stage enunciated in the above passage reveals immediately the orientation of the treatise and that of Hugh's whole thought-world. The author's concern was, to use a word which he did not use but which is quite suitable, existential.[2] The ultimate goal of the treatise on Noah's Ark and of the way of life there advocated was centered neither in penetrating analysis of the human predicament, nor in the solution of vexing theological problems in and of themselves. Such elements were present, to be sure, for Hugh was a man of no mean competence in such areas of endeavor. But the brethren, Hugh included, not only "marveled" at the "instability and restlessness of the human heart", wondering at the cause of such. They also "sighed" over it and sought a remedy for the "serious evil."[3] The telos toward which the complex of materials in the treatises moved was a way of making effective in life the truths concerning man's condition and his restoration. The elucidation of these truths in the course of study and enquiry was clearly only a first step---and one with only a preliminary benefit in the eyes of our Victorine canon.

---

[1] A. morl.I, 2, MPL 176:619/20, Sq. p. 47.

[2] Cf. the remarks of Schlette, Nichtigkeit, p. 106. "If we seek how the place of man between God and the world ought to be understood according to Hugh, and if the point particularly at issue is that to which the love of the human heart is directed, then we have here before us an existential (existentielles) and personal (personales) problem of the first order. The "existential" and the "personal" . . . appear in the twelfth century not in connection with the concepts existentia and persona but are expressed in the vast field of relationships (Beziehungsfeldern) of such key mystical-theological words as mens, cor, anima, amor, dilectio, charitas, voluntas."

[3] A. morl.I, 1, MPL 176:617/18, Sq., p. 45.

This attitude linking knowledge and virtue may be found throughout Hugh's writings. Knowledge which does not issue in virtuous living is not truly knowledge. Men who seek knowledge without a prior and concurrent attention to virtue are to be pitied.[1] The strictures were apparently directed against the new "style" of learning popular among some in the emerging schools of the twelfth century. But the underlying assumption was at the heart of the monastic tradition. Hugh probably got it from Cassian; Cassian, from the East. Cassian had said:

> Spiritual knowledge is twofold: first πρακτική actualis, practical which is brought about by an improvement of morals and purification from faults; secondly, θεωρητική which consists in the contemplation of things divine and the knowledge of most sacred thoughts. Whoever would arrive at this theoretical (contemplative) knowledge must first pursue practical knowledge with all his might and main. For this practical knowledge can be acquired without the contemplative, but the contemplative cannot possibly be gained without the practical.[2]

The molding of life is essential to the quest for knowledge. The roots were even Socratic, as Hugh noted in quoting Socrates to the effect that the study of virtue must cleanse the heart to prepare for the investigation of truth.[1]

---

[1] Cf. the pointed reference in Did., V, 10, Butt., p. 111, Tay., p. 134: "There are some who seek knowledge of the Sacred Scripture either in order that they may gather riches or in order that they may obtain honors or acquire fame. Their purpose ought to be commiserated in equal proportion to its perversity." Cf. Ibid., 6, pp. 104f., Tay., p. 128: "I nevertheless know that many seek knowledge rather than virtue in the study of the Sacred Word."

[2] Conferences, XIV. Quoted from Butler, Ben. Mon., p. 47. On Cassian and his teaching, cf. M. Olphe-Galliard, "Cassien," DdS, II, 214-276. On Cassian's debt to Evagrius, cf. ibid., and also O. Chadwick, John Cassian, pp. 77ff.; cf. esp. p. 86: "Evagrius was the principal teacher of Cassian, the chief authority for his ascetical doctrine. . . .the general line of the ascetical ideas which Cassian propagated to the western Church are found in Evagrius."

In the treatise on the moral Ark additional evidence appears to support what may be called a religio-affective orientation. This is shown by the way Hugh introduced the drawing of the Ark to his auditors. The drawing might be aesthetically pleasing through the beauty of the form and the creative use of color. But the primary purpose transcended this level of response. What the eye sees outwardly in the illustration, Hugh instructed the brethren, must be made into a pattern for the inward fashioning of the soul.[2] This introductory sentiment was echoed in the concluding paragraph of De arca Noe morali:

> Thus you may learn from an external form, which we have visibly depicted, what you ought to do interiorly, and when you have impressed the form of this pattern on your heart, you may rejoice that the house of God has been built in you.[3]

Hugh possessed a certain aesthetic sensitivity to color and form. He entered into a rather involved and lengthy paen of praise for the beauty and harmony of the geometrical subtleties of the structure of the Ark.[4]

---

[1] Cf. Did., VI, 14, Butt., pp. 131f., Tay., pp. 153f. Taylor calls this section, "Appendix A."

[2] A. morl., I, 7, MPL 176:622BC, Sq., p. 52.

[3] Ibid., IV, 21, Sq., p. 153. This passage is lacking in the Migne edition. For the Latin text of this, cf. Mierow, "A Description," p. 52.

[4] Cf. A. morl., I, 13, MPL 176:628C-629D. This portion is excluded from the English translation. De Lubac says of Hugh: "He was a man oriented toward visual images. He loved to see and to speak to eyes. He was moved by the beauty of visible things, especially by colors: In another of his works, in a chapter entitled, "De rerum variis coloribus," we find only a long exclamation of admiration." EM, II, i, 324. The chapter referred to is De trib. dieb., XII, MPL 176:820f.

In addition, he was also aware of the role which color, shape, and position can play in the learning process. They provide "tags" for the retention of all manner of things in the memory, from the psalms chanted in the liturgy to chronological data recorded in tables.[1] Memory, Hugh argued, lies at the basis of all learning, and shapes, colors, and positions form pedagogical aids for the student.

A certain amount of this didactic purpose coupled with aesthetic sensitivity can be felt in the approach to the drawing of the Ark. But Hugh went beyond pedagogy and aesthetics in commending the drawing. His attitude toward the visible symbol which he set before the students in the cloister of the abbey was in harmony with his symbolic frame of mind. Just as the visible world is intended to instruct man concerning the invisible things of the creator, so the visible symbol placed before the eyes was meant to conduct mental vision to the apprehension of a higher reality.[2] Again, it is not simply added knowledge which one seeks, but rather understanding which will then find application to life. Knowledge and virtue were to be joined in penetrating 'through' the visible symbol to the interior, invisible truth contained therein.

---

1. Cf. the preface to Hugh's Chronicon, ed. Green, "De tribus maximis" pp. 488ff.

2. Cf. IHC, I, i, MPL 175:926D: "It is impossible to represent invisible things except by means of those which are visible; therefore all theology of necessity must have recourse to visible representations in order to make known the invisible." The Ark is in the class of "symbolic demonstration" (symbolica demonstratio) in which "by forms, figures, and likenesses the truth of hidden things is represented (adumbratur)." Ibid., II, 941C. Cf. the comment of De Bruyne, L'esthétique du moyen âge, (Louvain, 1947), p. 93: "Symbolism is the aesthetic expression of ontological participation." Preeminently true of Hugh.

The religio-affective orientation of the Ark treatises placed them in the centuries-old tradition of monastic reflection and theology. As Chenu and Leclercq have demonstrated so well, the monastic climate nurtured a type of learning which was oriented toward the practical needs of persons, toward the liturgy, and toward the contemplative life.[1] This stood in contrast to the emerging "scientific" and objective climate of the schools. If we look for the elemental activities and concepts which regulated the life of the monastic, we find that the cloistered life was summed up to no small degree in the ascending series of *lectio*, *meditatio*, *oratio*, and *contemplatio*.[2] These were the regulative concepts of the monastic milieu and embodied the aspirations of the monastic life, in contrast to the *lectio*, *disputatio*, and *predicatio* of the scholastic masters.[3] They formed the warp of the fabric of monastic life. The woof, to continue the metaphor, was the regular round of liturgical observance, manual labor, copying, and communal gathering.[4] The two threads crossed and were mutually supportive. All of the resources of the community, including their erudition, were mobilized to effect this end.

---

1. Cf. Chenu, *TDS*, chap. XV, "Les Magistri. La 'science' theologique;" cf. esp. pp. 343-50 comparing monastic and scholastic theology. Leclercq, *LLDG*, chap. IX, "Monastic Theology."

2. Cf. the masterful summary of these terms in the context of Benedictine life in Berliere, *L'ascèse bénédictine*, pp. 169-233. Cf. also, Butler, *Ben. Mon.*, *passim*, and *West*, *Myst.*; also Dickinson, *Origins*, 72ff. and 77ff. on the question of Cistercian influence.

3. Paré, *et al*, *La renaissance*, pp. 122ff. Also, Chenu and Leclercq as cited just above.

4. Cf. again Berlière, *L'ascèse bénédictine*, pp. 108-14 and 150-68. For life at St. Victor, with a description of a typical day,cf. Bonnard, I, pp. 71ff.

In the opening lines of the prologue to De arca Noe morali, Hugh revealed that the treatise originated in what was most likely a traditional monastic collatio.[1] The assembled brethren were asking Hugh questions when the conversation turned to the "instability and restlessness of the human heart."[2] Implored by the brethren to explore the cause and remedy of this great evil, Hugh delivered what we now possess in the four books of the treatise on the moral Ark. Not only was it a treatise born of a monastic climate in its general tenor and telos. In the circumstances of its initial development the work appeared in the traditional locus for communal inquiry and reflection, the collation.

In the treatise it is quickly apparent that the contemplative life is being set before the brethren as the summit of re-integration to which they are to aspire. In the opening lines the goal was adumbrated. Speaking of man's fragmented, divided existence, Hugh proposed the remedy in terms of the "Great Mystic Postulate"[3] which Augustine formulated:

> So that our heart is always restless till such time as it begins to cleave to Him, in whom it may both rejoice that its desire lacks nothing, and be assured that what it loves will last eternally.[4]

---

[1] On the collatio, cf. Chenu, TDS, p. 344 and n. 3. Cf. also Paré, et al, La renaissance, pp. 121ff. for further discussion. The chapter held each day allowed for lectures or sermons and Bonnard thinks that Hugh and Richard possibly offered much of their teaching at this time. However, the context of Hugh's statement indicates something akin to the hora locutionis from None until Vespers (except on fast days), or else the general time for studies following the period of manual labor in the morning. Cf. Bonnard, I, 73-79.

[2] A. morl., I, 1, MPL 176:617/18, Sq., p. 45.

[3] The phrase is that of Cuthbert Butler, West. Myst.

[4] A. morl., I, 2, MPL 176:619/20, Sq. p. 47.

The remedy which Hugh proposed to the brethren, that the love of the world needs to be displaced by the love of God, immediately raised the question of the knowledge of God. In Augustinian fashion, Hugh maintained love of God and knowledge of God to be united: "Nobody can love that which he does not know; and so if we desire to love God, we must first make it our business to know Him . . . ."[1]

In pursuing the question of how man may best come to know God, Hugh turned to a human analogy. How do you get to know anyone? You come to know him by being in his company, and more specifically by being in his house and in the company of persons who are his friends and can tell you something about him:

> A man who wants to make himself acquainted with another person's character and inmost thoughts gets on to friendly terms with him, and is often at his house and in the company of those who are his intimates. And if he perceives this man's affairs to be well and wisely ordered, he at once becomes the more certain of his love because he knows that he has found such patent proofs of his worth.[2]

So, in seeking to know God, "let us likewise, therefore, inquire where God dwells, where His abode may be; let us interrogate His friends concerning Him."

---

[1] A. morl., I, 3, MPL 176:620A, Sq., p. 48. The coordinate nature of the knowledge and love of God echoes Augustine: cf. Enarr. in Psalm., CXXXV, 8, where Augustine says that contemplation, or "wisdom," "lies in cognition and love of That Which always is and unchangeably abides, namely God." Cited by Butler, West. Myst., p. 25.

[2] A. morl., I, 3, MPL 176:620B, Sq. 48f. This passage shows Hugh's ability to set a graphic scene. The vignettes in DVM, I, show this same literary talent.

Hugh directed his readers to the consideration of three places where God may be said particularly to "dwell."[1] They may be called, indeed, houses of God. First there is the entire world. Second, there is the Catholic Church in which God may be said to dwell. Finally every faithful soul may be called a house of God. With his usualpenchant for precision through parallels and antitheses Hugh described the manner in which God and believers inhabit each of these houses. In so doing, he presented three modes of relationship between God and man: The general one sustained in the order of creation; the narrower relationship between God and the community of believers, the Church; and the intimate relationship between God and the individual, described in terms of the indwelling of God in the soul of man. Hugh presented, as it were, a scheme of three concentric circles. Within each successive circle a more restrictive relationship between God and man was proposed. Between the two extremes of universality and particularity stands the Church, the community of the faithful. We should be reminded that the contemplative ideal proposed by the victorines was a life lived in a community. It was not a solitary flight and search for the divine. While calling men to Himself as One who is hidden, God also calls men together in unity:

> Why is it, then, that God always speaks in secret, if not because He calls us into what is hidden? And why does He speak with a few, if not that He may gather us together? Weigh these two things that I have said, *He gathers us together, and He calls us into what is hidden.*[2]

---

[1] *A. morl.*, I, 4, MPL 176:621AC, Sq., pp. 49ff.

[2] *A. morl.*, IV, 8, MPL 176:669A, Sq., p. 131.

In proposing the whole world as a house of God, Hugh described the presence of God as being "in the world as a ruler of His kingdom." By this Hugh meant that, "through the power of His Godhead He maintains and governs all that He has made."[1] In this mode of "dwelling" there is no hint that God is in any way "contained" or circumscribed by the created order in a pantheistic sense. Hugh consistently maintained the sharp distinction between the creator and his creation. This distinction was one of the cardinal points of faith put forward in _De sacramentis christianae fidei_.[2]

The use of the motifs of "house" and "indwelling" here and elsewhere was a means of describing the relationship between God and man in its various degrees. In this particular case the relationship was universal in its scope. All men, whether unbelievers or believers, dwell together within the "house" of this world and partake equally of the benefits of dwelling therein.

Men were in this house by virtue of their creation, for this house comprised the work of creation (_opus conditionis_) which was intended to supply all of the essential needs of mankind without any prejudice.

---

[1] _A. morl._, I, 4, MPL 176:621B, Sq., p. 49.

[2] I, x, 5, MPL 176:334C, Def., p. 172: "In the first part, right faith ought so to distinguish between Creator and creature that it attributes to each one of these what is his own . . . ."

As Hugh said:

> In the case of the first works, which are related to man's creation, God is the God of all, since He Himself created them and bestowed these temporal blessings indifferently on the good and bad alike . . . .[1]

The second house of God proposed by Hugh forms the basis of a more restricted relationship between God and man. The house is that of the Church, in which God dwells, "as the head of the family in His own home . . . ."[2] As the head of the household, God summons men to participate in this community. It is a limited segment of humanity. In the Church are those men whom God has called to faith.[3] But the Church is a mixed community, for Hugh as well as for Augustine. There are false believers along with the true.[4] In Biblical language, "there is still chaff on your threshing floor along with the wheat" if you are a member of the Church.[5]

The last of the three houses of God enumerated by Hugh was the individual soul. Here the circle was drawn to its smallest periphery. We have passed from the universal to the communal and now have arrived at the individual. This indwelling of God Hugh described as being like that of

---

[1] A. morl., IV, 6, MPL 176:667B, Sq., p. 128.

[2] Ibid., I, 4, 621B, p. 49.

[3] A. morl., I, 4, MPL 176:621C, Sq., p. 49.

[4] In the context of the Ark treatises this idea of false belief within the Church is to be seen in terms of stability and the "affection" of faith. The Church has within it men who conform outwardly and appear to believe, but their true love is with things of the world, or else in time of stress they fall away. Cf. A. morl. III, 4 and IV, 14, MPL 176:649A-651C and 674AD, Sq., pp. 97ff. and 141f., along with our analysis of these passages in the previous chapter.

[5] Ibid., I, 4, MPL 176:621C, Sq., p. 49.

"the bridegroom in the wedding chamber."[1] Without any extensive commentary, by the use of this figure Hugh immediately directed the attention of his readers to the contemplative ideal. The bride and bridegroom motif was drawn from the Song of Songs, a text of ancient use in the tradition of Christian spirituality.[2] It was the symbolic expression used perhaps above all others for the consummation of the mystic experience. Hugh never commented systematically on the Song of Songs. Yet in his writings we find numerous references to select verses and sections of the Canticle.[3] Hugh singled it out as the book having the most to do with contemplation.[4] Especially in his later period of activity, when several of the treatises on the contemplative life and on love were written, this Old Testament book absorbed his attention.[5] The sensitivity of Hugh's exposition of the

---

1. A. morl., I, 4, MPL 176:620B, Sq., p. 49.

2. Cf. the excellent section on the Song of Songs in Leclercq, LLDG, pp. 90-93. The masterpieces of medieval monastic literature are commentaries on the Canticle. "The Canticle of Canticles is a contemplative text . . . . One can understand why Origen commented it twice, why St. Gregory, St. Bernard and so many others preferred it over other parts of the Old and New Testaments." Ibid., p. 92. Non-monastic commentaries tended to emphasize the relationship of God to the whole church; monastic ones were devoted to the relation of God to the individual soul and mystic union. Ibid., p. 91. However, Origen proposed both levels of interpretation. Cf. his Comm. in Cant., I, i.

3. Cf. esp. De arrha animae, which is centered on the bride-bridegroom theme but also incorporates the other two "house" relationships of the world and the Church, and De amore sponsi ad sponsam, which is based on Song of Songs, 4, 6-8. On dating these, cf. van den Eynde, Essai, pp. 105-08; cp. Baron, Sci. et Sg., pp. xliv-xlix, and Études, pp. 84ff. In A. morl., IV, 9, MPL 176:669A-670C, Sq., pp. 132-34, Hugh uses Song of Songs 2, 10-12 as the basis for a moving portrayal of the divine solicitation which is both a "manifestation" and a "hiding" of God.

4. Cf. In Eccl., I, MPL 175:117B, Sq., p. 184.

5. Cf. De arrha animae and De sponsi ad sponsam.

material drawn from the Canticle is sure evidence of penetrating reflection and prolonged meditation upon this guide for the contemplative life.

The firm bond of this divine indwelling in the soul of man was by means of love:

> If you are in the house of God through love, blessed are you, for not only are you in the house of God, but you yourself have begun to be His house, to the intent that He who made you may also dwell in you.[1]

To attain this love of God, to build this house in preparation for the divine indwelling, is the end toward which each man must strive.

> If then this dwelling has begun to be in us, let us go in and abide with Him. There, where he "whose place is in peace" begins to make His dwelling, we shall find peace and rest. But if it has not yet begun to be in us, then let us build it . . . .[2]

The introduction of the pervasive theme of the house of God into a treatise on Noah's Ark is of more than passing significance. It set Hugh's treatises apart from the earlier tradition with respect to the exegesis of the Noachic material.[3]

Traditionally the Ark of Noah and the flood had been interpreted mainly in terms of ecclesiological and sacramental motifs, especially since the time of Tertullian.[1] Along with these dominant themes, however, we also find christological and eschatological typology associated with the Ark, its occupants, and the flood in the writings of the early Fathers of the Church. Noah the just man provided a type foreshadowing Christ. The number of people saved, eight, foreshadowed the resurrection, as well as Christian baptism, through numerical symbolism. The destruction of the world in the flood was seen as a type of the final conflagration in which the world would be destroyed not by water but by fire. These christological and eschatological themes gave way to the major sacramental and ecclesiological motifs emphasized by Tertullian. It was he who set the tone for succeeding generations of exegetes in the West. The Ark was seen as a type of the Church, "outside of which there is no salvation." The flood, destroying the evil world yet bearing up the Ark of salvation, was seen as a mystic foreshadowing of the sacrament of baptism, which both purges and saves. Likewise the wood of the Ark becomes typologically related to the wood of the Cross, thus prefiguring the passion of Christ.

---

[1] A. morl., I, 4, MPL 176:621B, Sq., p. 50.

[2] Ibid., 5, 621C.

[3] Cf. F. L. Battles, "Hugo of Saint-Victor as a Moral Allegorist," Church History, XVIII (1949), 236: "The symbol of the Ark is one of ancient use in Christian allegory, but Hugo's application of it has considerable originality." Battles then points to the theme of house-building and indwelling, "which gives name and unity to the treatise."

The allegorical interpretation of the Ark had a history much older than the exegesis of the Fathers. A symbolic interpretation of the flood, the vessel, and/or its occupants can be found in the Old Testament, rabbinic literature, and the New Testament. Much subsequent Christian exegesis of

---

1. This paragraph and the following one are very brief summaries of the excellent analysis of the early exegesis of the Ark material contained in Danielou, Shadows, pp. 169-212 . See the specific references and the development of material there. It is not our purpose to enter into an analysis either of the early exegesis of the Ark material or of the way in which Hugh incorporated that material. Cf. also Danielou, Bible and Liturgy, pp. 83-85 and the collection of materials from theFathers in DACL, I, ii, 2709ff.

the passage was determined by the First Epistle of Peter which, while drawing upon earlier Jewish patterns, interpreted the Noachic narrative typologically as a foreshadowing of salvation through baptism.[1]

Hugh was thoroughly cognizant of this entire traditional body of spiritual exegesis of the Ark and the flood. He used it extensively in his synopsis of biblical and ecclesiastical history contained in the last two books of _De vanitate mundi_.[2] To compare that material with the exegesis offered in the Ark treatises is to be convinced of the unique nature of the latter. The two interpretations move in different frames of reference and are centered upon different concerns. Some of the old interpretive motifs reappear in Hugh's treatises on the Ark. But it remains true that the major thrust of the image of the Ark is very different from that of the traditional commentaries, such as those by Ambrose, Bede, and Raban Maur.[3]

The difference which sets Hugh's treatises on the Ark apart from earlier reflections on the same theme lies in the introduction of the motif of the house and the accompanying orientation toward the concerns with which the traditional house-texts drawn from the Biblical material were associated.[1] Hugh has almost no concern with Noah and his family as types of Christ and of the Christian saved by baptism respectively. Nor does the traditional eschatological material make its appearance. An ecclesiological interpretation is present, but it differs from that of the older tradition. What we do find is the use of the Ark, particularly its structure, as the basis for the development of a long meditation upon the nature of the contemplative life, set within the context of a distinctive Victorine understanding of the Church. The Biblical house-texts, which like the Noachic material provided a locus for ecclesiological allegory, also furnished a significant locus for tropological interpretation in terms of divine indwelling. From these house-texts Hugh took his clue.

---

[1] Cf. I Pet. 3:20f.

[2] Cf. Bk. III, MPL 176:725D-726C.

[3] Comparing the treatises of Hugh and Ambrose on the Ark, E. K. Rand says, "The allegorizings differ. Hugo has introduced many modern improvements in the ancient craft, but it is the same old boat, patiently carrying whatever spiritual cargo was put aboard." _Founders of the Middle Ages_ (New York, 1957), p. 90. Cf. Ambrose, _De Noe et Arca liber unus_, MPL 14:361ff.; Bede, _Hexameron_, MPL 91:85ff.; Raban Maur, _Comm. in Gen. lib. quat._, MPL 107:513ff. To be noted in Raban's commentary are the extracts from earlier exegetes, esp. Isidore on mystical senses.

Two of the leading 'house-texts' of the Old Testament were the massive blocks of material associated with the planning, construction, furnishing, and use of the Tabernacle built in the desert by Moses and the Temple constructed in Jerusalem by Solomon.[2] The persons involved in the work of construction, the dimensions and materials of the structures, the interior furnishings and the miscellaneous details of Temple and tabernacle offered a rich mine of material for allegorical and tropological exegesis.

---

[1] Cf. Battles, "Hugo of Saint-Victor," p. 238: "The importance of the _De Arca Noe Morali_ in the history of moral allegory lies in the fact that Hugo has transferred from the commentaries the standard house-texts whose interpretation had been developed by many generations of exegetes and has welded them into the allegorical framework of a didactic piece."

[2] Cf. Ex. 26ff. and I Kings 6ff.

The Venerable Bede authored two treatises, one on Solomon's temple, the other on the Tabernacle, which admirably summed up the tradition of western exegesis in connection with these two buildings with their hidden, mystical meanings.[1] _De templo Salomonis_ was primarily concerned with the allegorical exposition of the Temple of Solomon as a figure of the "holy universal Church", "part of which is still exiled (_peregrinatur_) on earth from its Lord, part has come through the cares of its peregrination and reigns with Him in heaven as the whole will some day reign when the Last Judgement is past."[2] The treatise _De tabernaculo et eius vasibus_ begins with a concern for tropology and the figuring of the soul of man in the ancient building. The people of the law were instructed to build a material sanctuary. But, Bede notes, the people who form the spiritual Israel, i.e. the Church, are now commanded to form and inhabit another sanctuary. This is to be a sanctuary within, found in the very heart of man. Thus, Bede begins his exposition of the structure of the Tabernacle in light of a tropological and contemplative motif.[3]

---

[1] For Bede's place in the history of exegesis, cf. Spicq, _Esquisse_, pp. 29ff. On Bede's exegesis, cf. Claude Jenkins, "Bede as Exegete and Theologian," _Bede, His Life, Times, and Writings_, ed. A. Hamilton Thompson (Oxford, 1935), pp. 152-200. Cf. also Sister M. Thomas Aquinas Carroll, _The Venerable Bede: His Spiritual Teachings_ ("The Catholic University of America Studies in Mediaeval History," New Series, Vol. IX; Washington, D. C., 1946).

[2] Jenkins, "Bede as Exegete," p. 181. The text of _De templo_ is in MPL 91.

[3] _De tabernaculo_, MPL 91:499C. Cf. Jenkins, "Bede as Exegete," _passim_, on the interpretation of the Tabernacle.

Both of these strands of thought appear in the treatises on the Ark. However, in the first treatise, De arca Noe morali, the title rightly points to the aspect which looms the largest. It is tropology, which is concerned with the shaping of life and the building of the Ark of wisdom in the heart of man, which forms the essential focus. Never, however, was the church in any manner put aside. Victorine mystical thought was set within the communal life of those who are members incorporate of the body of Christ. In bidding the reader to set the bounds of his thought in accord with the mysteries of the dimensions of the Ark, Hugh reminded him: "If you do not believe that the Church will continue till the end of the age, but think that God at some time must abandon it, then you go beyond the three hundred cubits' length."[1] To exit from this ark is to court disaster. "Storm and tempest rage outside, if you issue forth in any direction at all you will be wrecked."[2] The allegorical and tropological interpretations are interdependent, for the life of the church and the life of contemplation are mutually reinforcing. The quest of the individual for restoration and reunion is set within the communal longings for the same fruition.

Now briefly, let us see what Hugh proposed in terms of an allegorical exegesis of the Noachic material. What Hugh proposed was a decisive shift of emphasis. By means of allegory, Hugh threw into bold relief the historical dimension of the Church's life. The three hundred cubits which measured the length of the ark denote "this present age, which extends over three periods--namely, the period of natural law, the period of the written law, and the period of grace . . . ."[1] The length of the Ark represents the movement of the church through history from beginning until end, always under the impress of eschatological fulfillment:

---

[1] A. morl., II, 2, MPL 176:636B, Sq., p. 75.

[2] Ibid., 636AB.

> Holy Church is from the world's beginning to its end advancing from this present life towards the future glory.[2]
>
> The Church, which began when the world began, . . . will last till the end of the age. This is the ark, of which we have set out to speak; . . . through successive generations Holy Church reaches from the beginning to the end.[3]

Hugh's view was focused upon the peregrination of the people of God, the believers in Christ in all ages making their way through this world's history under the providence of God.[4] Never, Hugh insisted, has there been a time in the history of the world when there have not been believers in Christ. Christ has his faithful followers in all ages.[5] Only as one scrutinizes the historical record of this perigrination and begins to penetrate into the inner meaning of the significant events in this history can it be said he has truly begun to enter into the circle of faith.

---

[1] A. morl., I, 14, MPL 176:629D-630A, Sq., p. 64. The length of the Ark of Noah and of the Temple had been referred to the span of time from Creation to the eschaton, but Hugh sees it in terms of dynamic movement.

[2] Ibid., 630A.

[3] Ibid., I, 10, 625D, p. 58. Cf. the mirroring of this in A. myst. III, MPL 176:685.

[4] Recall the motif of Christ the King leading His faithful in all ages, before and after the Incarnation, as they do battle with the Devil down the corridor of history. Cf. also the figure of Christ in the drawing. His arms extend so that they embrace all things, i.e. the machina universitatis. Hugh interpreted this to mean "that all things are under His control." A. morl., I, 10, MPL 176:626A, Sq., p. 58.

[5] Cf. A. myst., III, MPL 176:685BC and the restatement in connection with the three periods of history, etc., in DSNSL, MPL 176:32B.

History stands at the basis of the victorine understanding of the Christian religion. By means of allegory, Hugh effectively presented the creative tension between past, present, and future within which authentic Christian existence must be lived. The allegories of the width and height reinforce the historical and eschatological foci of the interpretation of the length of the Ark. The fifty cubits width denotes "all believers everywhere, who are established under one Head, that is Christ."[1] Christ is not only Head of His Church; he is also the "goal of our desires."[2] The thirty cubits height denotes "the thirty volumes of the Holy Writ . . . wherein is contained the sum of all the things that God has either done, or else is going to do, for His Church."[3] Church, history, and eschatology coalesce within the bounds of the unique record of God's saving acts and providential purpose for mankind. All of this was admirably summed up when Hugh spoke of the Church with her Noah, Jesus Christ:

> And to put it more exactly, the Church is herself the ark, which her Noah, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Helmsman and the Haven, is guiding through the tempests of this present life, and leading through Himself unto Himself.[4]

---

[1] A. morl., I, 14, MPL 176:630A, Sq., p. 64.

[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., 629D. Cf. Ibid., 10, 626A, p. 59: "He [Jesus Christ] it is who makes a track across the sea; for, guiding His body the Church through the storms of this life, as it were the ark in the flood, He brings her at last to the haven of eternal rest."

In De arca Noe mystica, the historical thrust of this allegory was heightened as Hugh described the visualization of the progress of history along the length of the Ark. As we have already seen, the Ark contained the genealogy of Christ and the succession of Popes to mark the progress of the Church through the generations of men. Also, in a very intricate piece of color-symbolism Hugh depicted the development of the Church through the three periods of natural law, written law, and grace with the concommitant relationships of the men typical of each period.

In the disposition of the three stories of the Ark High saw the life of the church mirrored. The stories signified the various states of spiritual perfection existing within the one body of the Church, while the narrowing of the Ark toward the top indicated the decrease in numbers with increasing perfection.

> The three stories signify the three ranks of believers that there are in the Church, where of the first have commerce with the world, albeit lawfully, the second are fleeing from it and forgetting it, and the third already have forgotten it, and they are near to God.
>
> The fact that the ark gets narrower toward the top and wider below means that in holy Church there are more people leading a carnal life than there are persons of a spiritual life, it being always the rule that the more perfect are proportionately few in number.[1]

Hugh also proposed a five-storied Ark, which he expounded allegorically.[2] The first three levels were taken as referring to the spiritual perfection of members of the church. They were distinguished as carnal (carnales), sensuous (animales), and spiritual (spirituales).[1] Without defining the terms, Hugh was content to employ Pauline terminology at this point.[2] The fourth and fifth stories were taken to indicate the state of that life which is to come:

---

[1] A. morl., I, 14, MPL 176:630B, Sq., pp. 64f.

[2] Cf. A. morl. I, 15 and 16, MPL 176:631C-633C, Sq., pp. 67-70. On the role of the five-storied Ark in the exegesis of the Noachic material, cf. supra, pp. 179 ff.

> The fourth state is that of souls who have laid off the body. The fifth state is that of those who rise in soul and body; this is the highest state, and bordering on the highest cubit.[3]

The five states were correlated with the various inhabitants of the stories.[4] The dung of the first story fitly figured carnal persons, for they produced rottenness. The foodstores in the second level justly indicate the sensuous men who, while not forsaking the world themselves nevertheless support spiritual men and thus are "foodstores for the holy animals." Wild animals, occupying the third story, signify spiritual persons who although they are obedient to God still know the impulses of desires of the flesh. The tame animals of the fourth story figure deceased men who are free from "forbidden desires." On the fifth story dwell men and birds. The full spirituality of mind and body are thus signified:

---

[1] A. morl., I, 15, MPL 176:631D, Sq., p. 67.

[2] Cf. Baron, Sci. et Sg., p. 128, n. 196, who calls the presentation "very schematized."

[3] A. morl. I, 15, MPL 176:631D, Sq., p. 67. The time before the Day of Judgment is an intermediate period in which the souls of the saved are with Christ, but their bodies lie in sepulchres; cf. DS, II, viii, 10, MPL 176:468CD, Def., p. 311.

[4] For the following, cf. A. morl. I, 15, MPL 176:632B-633A, Sq., pp. 68ff.

> The vigour of reason and intelligence is denoted by man and the mobility of incorruptible nature by the birds . . . . Our minds will fly by contemplation; our bodies by incorruption.[1]

In this fifth state, after the Last Day, life will be totally transformed and all will be united with the One:

> When our bodily senses are themselves converted to reason, and reason into understanding, then understanding will pass over into God, to whom we shall be united through the one Mediator between God and men, the Lord Jesus Christ.[2]

Hugh found an added significance in the relationship of the walls to the roof. The contrast between the vertical walls, which enclosed the first three stories, and the sloping roof, which contained the upper two was symbolic of the contrast between the knowledge of God possible in this world, and the knowledge in heaven:

> The fact that the walls of the three lower stories rise vertically . . . and do not slope inwards towards the topmost cubit, means that whatever progress we may make in this life, we are nevertheless in some sense still turned away from our Creator's face. For, although we rise by merit, we are still not bent in towards Him by immediate vision.[3]

Thus, the Ark in its structure manifested a major theme of Hugh's thought. Full knowledge of God, consummated in the _visio Dei_, is beyond the realm of possibility in this life. Here and now man lives a life of faith: "He [God] puts off . . . full health, full knowledge, full felicity, and in the meantime enlightens our blindness through faith, so that advancing by its means, we may deserve to come into His open glory."[4]

---

[1] _Ibid._, 632D-633A, p. 69. [2] _Ibid._, 633A.

[3] _A. morl._, I, 15, MPL 176:632A, Sq., p. 68.

[4] _Ibid._, IV, 8, 668C, pp. 130f.

After allegorically interpreting the Ark of Noah as the Church, Hugh offered a brief tropological interpretation of the dimensions of the Ark. The building of virtues which man erects within himself was described as,

> three hundred cubits long in faith of Holy Trinity, fifty cubits wide in charity, and thirty cubits high in the hope that is in Christ, . . .[1]

This exegesis was intended, apparently, to indicate the "ark of mother grace" which Hugh had introduced earlier along with the Ark of Noah, the Ark of the Church, and the Ark of wisdom.[2] An explanation of the other three Arks had been promised in order to prepare the way for the more lengthy consideration of the Ark of wisdom.

The second and fourth books of De arca Noe morali dealt with the construction of the Ark of wisdom. Hugh introduced the building of this dwelling place for God in the manner of the traditional commentaries on "house-texts."[3] Three questions were primary: The place to build the house; the material of which to build it; and finally who the builder may be. Hugh replied: The place in which the house is to be built is the heart of man; the material should be pure thoughts; the builders are two: God and man.[4]

---

[1] A. morl., I, 18, MPL 176:634C, Sq., p. 72.

[2] Ibid., 11, 626CD, pp. 59f.

[3] Cf. Battles, "Hugo of Saint-Victor," p. 237ff. on Hugh's indebtedness to the diffuse "house-text" tradition. Battles sees one of Hugh's achievements, reflecting the "order-through-classification" tendency of the twelfth century, in the "grouping of heretofore scattered allegorical significations under certain dominant motifs." Ibid., p. 240.

[4] Cf. A. morl., IV, 1 and 2, MPL 176:663B-665B, Sq., pp. 123-25.

Such a house for God requires no great financial or material resources. Hugh contrasted this interior dwelling with the building of magnificent ecclesiastical edifices and the constant search for rare and costly materials in the process. God does not demand this of man.[1] What God desires is that He find a heart prepared for Him.

> And what shall I say of the cost? There is no need to cross the seas and search out unknown places to procure precious stones and choice marbles. There is no need to ship tall cedars out of Lebanon across deep seas, or gather together I know not how many thousands of craftsmen, such as would drain the resources even of kings. None of these things is required of you. You will build a house for the Lord your God *in and of yourself*.[2]

To the hesitant of spirit, Hugh addressed a vigorous exhortation. It is not by human skill that this building rises. God is the builder, and He has taught many men to build.[3] Human effort is not negated here, for much is demanded of the man who seeks to return to God. But ultimately God's grace is operative in it all: "Indeed the work of God in us is with us and our work in ourselves is from Him, as His gift."[4] There are many from whom the novice may take heart, for God has made builders of many men, as Scripture records.

---

[1] "That is not what your God requires from you. He is not telling you to buy a piece of land from someone else, in order to extend His courts. He wants to dwell in your own heart--extend and enlarge that!" *Ibid.*, IV, 1, 663C, p. 122.

[2] *Ibid.*, 663D, p. 123.

[3] Cf. *A. morl.*, IV, 1, MPL 176:664BD, Sq., pp. 123f.

[4] *Ibid.*, 2, 665B, p. 125. Cf. *ibid.*, 7, 667D, p. 129 emphasizing the need for man to exercise his will and the prevenient grace of God moving him to do so. Hugh maintained a tension, rather than resolving it systematically. On the relation between free will and grace, cf. *DS*, I, vi, 16, MPL 176:272C-273B, Def., pp. 104ff., where Hugh considers the freedom of the will before sin, after sin, in restoration, and in fulfillment. The manner is Augustinian, using the scheme of freedom to sin, freedom not to sin, no freedom to sin, etc.

> He taught Noah to build the ark. He showed Moses the pattern on which he was to build the ark (of the covenant). He taught Bezaleel. He enlightened Solomon with wisdom, that he might build a temple to His name. Paul the apostle too He made a builder, and many others whom it would take a long time to enumerate.[1]

Moses and the ark of the covenant; Bezaleel and the tabernacle; Solomon and the Temple: These buildings were the chief "house-texts" of the Old Testament.[2] Deftly Hugh associated the Ark of Noah with them. To canons regular immersed in Scripture through liturgical and private lectio divina the recollection of the divine inspiration and guidance afforded each of the builders would follow easily and convincingly.[3]

But God has not only inspired a multitude of men. He Himself is the Builder.[4] He created the world from nothing. The marvelous intricacy and perfection of the created order never ceased to amaze Hugh, and here it offered an analogy to spiritual building:

> You may well judge, then, what He can do in things invisible, who has disposed things visible in such a marvellous way.[5]

A question remains. How can this great Builder be summoned to the aid of man? He can be summoned by love.[6] Hugh pointed to the promise made in the Gospel according to John: "If a man love Me, he will keep My words; and My Father will love him, and We will come to him and make Our abode with him."[1] Here is the key to the quest. In the words of a later treatise, love is the great highway between God and man.[2] As Hugh interprets the Gospel text, God has not only promised to abide with the man who seeks Him through love. He also has promised to make the dwelling Himself. The Creator of the universe does not hesitate to build a house in the heart of man.

---

[1] Ibid., 1, 664B, p. 123.

[2] For Moses, cf. Ex. 25, exp. vss. 9 and 40; for Bezaleel (RSV: Bezalel), cf. Ex. 31:1-10; 35:30-36:1; for Solomon, cf. I Kings 4:29-6:38.

[3] On the degree to which monastic life was immersed in Biblical language and images, cf. Leclercq, LLDG, pp. 79-83, on "reminiscence" and "Biblical imagination."

[4] A. morl., IV, 1, MPL 176:664C, Sq., p. 123.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid. , 664C-665C, pp. 123f.

> He did not say, "We will come to an abode already made," but "We will come and make an abode with him." I understand it thus, that the Lover of a pure heart cannot abide with us, unless he first make in us an abode for Himself.[3]

In another biblical context Hugh found the indication of the materials for the House to be built in the heart of man.[4] Proverbs speaks of Wisdom building her house and Wisdom proclaims: "I, wisdom, dwell in counsel and am present in reasonable thoughts."[5] Nothing could be more clear to Hugh. God Himself is the Wisdom who here speaks, declaring that He will build His house and what materials shall be used.

---

[1] Chap. 24:23.

[2] Cf. De laude caritatis, esp. chaps. IV and V, MPL 176:973A-975A, trans. A Religious of C.S.M.V., The Divine Love, pp. 15-19. The chapter divisions are in the English text only.

[3] A. morl., IV, 1, MPL 176:664D, The first sentence in this quote is present in the Migne text but missing in the English trans. (Sq., p. 124). The trans. here is from Battles, "Hugo of Saint-Victor," p. 238.

[4] Ibid., 664D-665A.

[5] Chap. 8:12 (Vulg., trans. Sq.). Cf. also chap 9:1, "Wisdom hath builded her house."

Having thus defined the place, materials, and builders of the house, Hugh then turned to the problem of actually constructing this building. Every building calls for the consideration of three things at the outset: Order, arrangement, and precise measurement.

> And so it remains for us to find out what sort of order and arrangement there should be in our thought, so that a house for God may be built of them.[1]

Then one must consider the precise measurements of the building. Hugh reminded his readers that they should keep in mind that in this house, "the Resident, is God, the infinite and measureless."[2]

The order and arrangement of thoughts was crucial. Hugh had a heightened sensitivity to the disorder present in man's existence. At times, he seems obsessed with the chaotic nature of man's life and thoughts, and this perception of the world was conditioned by his understanding of the Fall. In his present existence man has no center of stability. He is attached to things which themselves are temporal and mutable while the only ultimate stability lies with God who is immutable and eternal. Add to this temporality and mutability of the world the fact that the number of the objects of man's desire are now infinite, and chaos results.

> For since the worldly things that we desire so unrestrainedly are infinite, the thoughts that we conceive when we remember them cannot be finite. As from moment to moment they arise one after another in so many different ways, even we ourselves cannot give any account of whence or how they enter or leave the mind.[3]

A man becomes that which he loves. Love transforms. And amor mundi drives man to infinite distraction by seeking fulfillment in a world which can only offer a fragmented and divided reality.

---

[1] A. morl., IV, 3, MPL 176:665B, Sq., p. 125.

[2] Ibid., 665C. [3] Ibid., 4, 665D, p. 126.

How can men "restrain their hearts from this immoderate distraction"[1] which the world offers to the senses, and in offering such distraction to the senses, shapes the mind to a similar disorder? The answer to this question was determined in part by the Victorine metaphysic and psychology. ~~The~~ human mind, the "sphere of thought," bears a certain resemblance to God in that things past, present, and future exist therein simultaneously by thought.[2] In God the "causes of all things exist eternally without change or temporal differentiation." The mind has the potential to transcend the flux of time if it will shape its thoughts upon things other than the mutable world of sensual reality:

> If, then, we have begun to live persistently in our own heart through the practice of meditation, we have already in a manner ceased to belong to time; and, having become dead as it were to the world, we are living inwardly with God.[3]

This inward life leads to detachment and implicitly to the virtue of apatheia extolled by Cassian and his spiritual master Evagrius and introduced by Clement of Alexandria into Christian circles.[1]

---

[1] *A. morl.*, IV, 4, MPL 176:666A, Sq., p. 126.

[2] Cf. the introduction of this theme in *ibid.*, II, 1, 635A, p. 73.

[3] *Ibid.*, 635B.

> We shall then easily make light of anything that fortune brings upon us outwardly, if our heart is there fixed where we are not subject to change, where we neither seek to have again things past, nor look for those to come, where we neither desire the pleasant things of this life, nor fear things contrary.[2]

It is not easy to withdraw into the interior world of the mind. Man has "forgotten" what this world is. The mind has become so enamored of the things of the visible world that the images of these have clouded over the invisible things of the spirit.[3] In the words of the Ark treatise: "A mind accustomed to things that can be seen cannot so soon rise up to unseen things . . . ."[4]

---

[1] Cf. Bouyer, La spiritualité, pp. 334ff., 462f., and 597f. Apatheia for Clement and Evagrius meant the state of the man who "has succeeded in freeing himself from exterior influences by being able to dominate them." P. 335. It is a calming of the disorder of man's fallen state and the beginning of stability. It is "the peace of the soul not only in face of external things but in the face of our thoughts which recall them interiorly; . . ." P. 462. Cassian translated "apatheia" as "purity of heart" (probably because of anti-Origenist feelings at the time) but the meaning continues and thus enters the mainstream of Western spirituality: "Under the term purity of heart he [Cassian] is teaching the essence of the Evagrian apatheia . . . . Like the Evagrian apatheia, purity of heart, according to Cassian, tends to be established in a relatively stable state." P. 597. On Cassian and Evagrius, cf. also the summary by Chadwick, John Cassian, pp. 84ff. and 91ff. Chadwick, however, sees apatheia as a negative quality, a 'stripping away', and needs corection by Bouyer. Cf. further M. Olphe-Galliard, "Cassian," DdS, II, 214ff.

[2] A. morl., II, 1, MPL 176:635B, Sq., p. 75.

[3] Cf. De Unione, MPL 177:288BC; also Did., I, 1, Butt., pp. 4ff., Tay., pp. 46ff.

[4] A. morl., MPL 176:671B, Sq., p. 136.

To initiate the process of interiorization and recollection in order to achieve some stability it is necessary to find "certain definite objects to engage our attention seriously and to occupy our thoughts."[1] Three options are open. Men can divide their attention between a number of things; they can concentrate on a single object, or they can change the object of their attention within certain limits.[2] In his inconstancy, change between a number of objects is precisely what man is engaged in right now, and it is to this that he ought not to submit. On the other hand, it is impossible that man should be able to concentrate on one object for he cannot be truly constant in heart. This leaves one alternative as a viable option: To change attention within limits. This is a negative limitation, a restraining of the heart from its manifold desires. But it is also the first step in a positive direction, the attainment of some stability:

> We should for the time being at least recollect our hearts from their unrestrained distractions. And in this way, while we are always striving to be less unstable, we may be getting ever nearer to some semblance of true stability.[3]

In a rather abstract statement, this is the traditional teaching of ascetic renunciation. One withdraws from the desires of the world in order to begin the process of drawing near to God. And for Hugh, the prime quality of nearness to God was stability. It is fair to say that for Hugh the goal of all endeavors was found in the movement which sought to bring order out of chaos. This was true whether it be in the grand quest of the contemplative life, or in the training of young men in exegesis or divinity.[1]

---

[1] A. morl., IV, 4, MPL 666A, Sq., p. 126.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

In the structure of the Ark Hugh found a reflection of the movement in turning from the multiplicity of the desires of the world toward the unity which is found in God and in the love of God. In the world there is "horrible confusion" and "infinite distraction of the minds of men." With God, there is "perpetual, unshakable stability." Between these two the human soul has been placed, and Hugh invites his readers to picture,

> a human soul rising out of this world towards God and, as it rises, gathering itself ever more and more into a unity. Then we shall be able to see in a spiritual manner the form of our ark, which was broad at the bottom and narrowed gradually as it rose, till at the peak it came to measure a single cubit only.[2]

---

[1] Cf. the ordering of the disciplines of history, allegory and tropology in the introduction to lectio divina, as considered supra. The prologue to Book I of DS carries the same note of order brought out of chaos: "I have compressed this brief summa, as it were, of all doctrine into one continuous work, that the mind may have something definite to which it may affix and conform its attention, lest it be carried away by various volumes of writings and a diversity of readings without order or direction." MPL 176:183/84, Def., p. 3. Cf. Did., VI, 4, Butt., p. 120. Tay., p. 142: "For in such a great sea of books and in the manifold intricacies of opinions which often confound the mind of the student both by their number and their obscurity, the man who does not know briefly in advance . . . some definite principle which is supported by firm faith and to which all may be referred, will scarcely be able to conclude any single thing."

[2] A. morl., IV, 4, MPL 176:666B, Sq., p. 126.

This ascension is made by means of an interior transformation of man. One ascends as he grows steadily in the virtues as by stages in his heart and finds himself gradually drawn towards a unity. Finally, Hugh concludes, we may reach "that true simplicity and everlasting changelessness, that is in God."[1]

Thus far we have seen Hugh's clear delineation of the manner in which the building of the Ark of Wisdom must be approached and the place of "right thoughts" and the acquisition of the virtues in this work jointly effected by human striving and divine grace within the heart of man. Yet the one crucial question we have left unanswered: What are the things upon which man must mold his thoughts? What are the objects, which we may assume God has provided, between which man may vary his attention since he cannot remain constant in his devotion to one object of affection? In short, if the world is to be displaced as the object of affection, if *amor mundi* is to be displaced in the heart of man, how does the invasion of charity, or *amor Dei* become effective? What is "the manner of our reintegration?"

Man's thoughts are brought to reintegration by one thing, by the works of restoration. In these works man may find theorder of thought and discover the bounds for his thought so that limits may be set and order achieved.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, 666C, p. 127. Cf. *ibid.*, 6, 667A, p. 128: "So that [the soul] may gradually form the habit of withdrawing itself from the distraction of this world, to the intent that it may rise up strengthened to that supreme stability, the contemplation of God."

> We have shown by what means our thought can be reintegrated--that is by the works of restoration. And because, as we said above, there can be no order where there is no limit, it remains for us now, having left the works of creation behind us, to seek out the order of our thoughts where they are bounded--that is, in the works of restoration.[1]

In counselling the brethren to seek the inception of restoration in meditation upon the works of restoration, Hugh intended to direct them to the warp and woof of history. The object of meditation should be neither eternal, abstract ideas, after the manner of Plato and the Platonist tradition nor solely the present sacramental life of the Church. The foundation of man's integration was a series of deeds done in time (*series narrationem gestorum*). The works of restoration, as Hugh reminded his readers,

> are all the things that have been done or that still must be done, for the restoration of man, from the beginning of the world until the end of the age.[2]

He who would perceive the significance of these things which already have been done must apply himself diligently to the task. He must,

---

[1] *A. morl.*, IV, 17, MPL 176:677A, Sq., p. 146.

[2] *Ibid.*, 18, 677B, p. 147.

> consider both the things that were done (res gestas), and the people through and for and among whom they were done, and also the places and the times where and when they were done.[1]

Events, people, places, and times: These are the elemental stuff of which history is composed.[2] They were the basic material upon which the *homo interior* ought to focus his attention in the gradual formation of his thoughts with the intention of building the Ark of Wisdom within the inner recesses of his mind. Restoration, recollection, and interiorization begin for Hugh with penetrating regard for events in the *external, material* world. Redemption is not a flight from the world of time and space, but rather a progress within that world toward a transcendent end. The work of restoration looks to the celestial beatitude of the saints and toward the eschatological consummation of the historical process. But for all that, this work is none the less firmly grounded in the world in which man lives. It began with the onset of man's need to be restored and it will continue until the end of the world. *This* world, not some other world, is the place ordained for man's restoration; the time is the time from the beginning of the world until the end of the same.[3]

---

[1] *A. morl.*, *IV*, 18, MPL 176:677B, Sq., p. 147.

[2] Cf. *Did.*, VI, 3, Butt., p. 114, Tay., p. 136: "For these are the four things which are especially to be sought for in history--the person, the business done, the time, and the place."

[3] Cf. *DS*, I, viii, 1, MPL 176:305C-306C, Def., p. 141f.

In commending meditation and reflection upon the works of restoration, Hugh intended to direct the attention of the brethren to the whole of sacred scripture. From the Bible and from the Bible alone knowledge of the works of restoration may be derived: "Divine Scripture has as subject matter the works of restoration."[1] All other writings fall into the category of "worldly or secular" writings, with their subject being the works of foundation.[2] Consequently the Bible is a unique source for man's knowledge of the way in which he may find stability and reintegration in this life. In individual reading and meditation as well as in communal recollection and meditation via the regular participation in the liturgy the canon regular found in scripture the marvelous record of what God had wrought in the past for the salvation of mankind and what He promised for the future. Here was voice of God calling man "back from the love of this world to that of Himself."[3]

In the concept of the works of restoration as the "call of God" the fundamental logic of the works of restoration and of their place in the initiation of the contemplative quest emerges. As Hugh explained in

---

[1] Ibid., prol., ii, 183A, p. 3. Cf. DSSS, II and XVII, MPL 175:11C and 24A: "The material of the divine Scriptures consists in the works of restoration." "The material of sacred scripture is the Incarnate Word with all of his sacraments, . . ."

[2] Ibid.

[3] A. morl., IV, 10, MPL 176:671C, Sq., p.136. Cf. ibid., 9, 669AB, p. 132.

De arca Noe morali, God could have brought man after the Fall to his destined end, the visio Dei, in any manner He so desired.[1] Hugh, contrary to Anselm of Canterbury, found no necessary reasons for the Incarnation as the mode of man's redemption. Hugh taught that the works of restoration were molded in God's ineffable wisdom to instruct man and to lead him back from the distance over which he had strayed.[2] In a very real sense, the works of restoration conformed to the condition and to the needs of fallen man and not to the rigorous logic of an immutable cosmic law. It was the concrete, conditioned-by-the-Fall state of man which determined the manner of his restoration.

Throughout the Ark treatises fallen man was presented as blind and unstable, or ignorant and concupiscent.[3] Nowhere else, except perhaps in De vanitate mundi,[4] did Hugh portray the state of man in such moving language of despair. The creature created in the image of God, he who once beheld his Maker inwardly with an inner eye and heard Him with an inner ear, was no longer sensitive to the inward, spiritual dimension of life.

---

1. A. morl., IV, 5, MPL 176:666C, Sq., p. 127.

2. On this non-necessity, the opposition to Anselm's position, and the motif of instruction, cf. supra, pp. 258 ff.

3. Cf. A. morl., IV, 10, MPL 176:671A, Sq., p. 135: "But after he was cast out from before God's face because of his transgression, he became blind and unstable, blind through mental ignorance and unstable through fleshly concupiscence . . . . Since men were thus subject to the darkness of ignorance and unaware of the existence of any other invisible good things, it was inevitable that they should lose control of themselves through the lust for earthly things which can be seen."

4. Cf., e.g., Book II, MPL 176:711ff., Sq., p. 171ff.

> Before he sinned, the first man had no need for God to speak to him outwardly, for he possessed an ear within his heart by which he could hear God's voice after a spiritual manner. But when he opened his outward ear to listen to the serpent's guile, he closed his inward to the voice of God.[1]

The works of restoration were an "outward" action of God whereby the divine confronts man in and through the visible world of space-time. Since man is turned totally "outward" for all intents and purposes, God approaches him in a manner which takes this into account.

> Because a mind accustomed to things that can be seen cannot so soon rise up to unseen things, He Himself decided to perform some miracles that could be seen, whereby our attraction for Him might be strengthened and His love towards us proved. Now these things have a special connexion with man's restoration.[2]

This is why history was so important to Hugh.[3] Through the Incarnation of the Word and the sacraments preceeding and following, God approached man in a new way, neither abstract nor intuitive. It was embedded in the texture of human life and the world.

This history has an obvious meaning, discernable in facts. But it also has a hidden meaning for those who can penetrate into the mystical sense of single events and the connections between two or more events within this sweep of time. History becomes "sacramental," for it bears a deeper meaning. The works of restoration, deeds done in time, become a new mode of the divine presence to man.

---

1. A. morl., IV, 9, MPL 176:669A, Sq., p. 132.

2. Ibid., 10, 671B, Sq., p. 136.

3. Chatillon, "Chronique," p. 161 suggests that Hugh's emphasis upon the historical sense of scripture may have been motivated by Dionysian influences, namely the "signification of things because they are truly and ontologically the symbol of superior realities, . . ." While Dionysius did influence Hugh, this suggestion fails to take into account the historical sense which Hugh shows and also the ahistorical nature of Dionysian thought.

In the perfection of creation man both beheld God within himself and could "see" in the mirror of nature the power, wisdom, and goodness of God. Now man needs more than a manifestation of the divine, for he has lost his inner sense. Man needs to be "healed." This the works of restoration accomplish. They provided, first, a new locus for the presence of God and second, a new capacity for perceiving Him.

The first book of In hierarchiam expressed this well.[1] The two simulacra, the works of creation and of restoration, both manifest God, but fallen man does not comprehend God equally in each. The works of creation signify the creator, but they are unable to illumine man's present blindness. The Incarnate Word, the center of the works of restoration, is medicine for man's blindness and leads men to right knowledge. In the works of creation, man may know that God exists. In the works of restoration, God is again present to mankind. There is a difference between the two. In the sacramental events of salvation history God is present to man and also in the sacramental actions of the liturgy he is also present.

In De sacramentis christianae fidei Hugh used the metaphor of the "book of Wisdom" to develop the same thought:

---

[1] Chap. 1, MPL 175:926.

> Wisdom was a book written within [man]; the work of wisdom a book written without. But He willed afterwards that it still be written otherwise without, that wisdom might be seen more manifestly and be recognized more perfectly, that the eye of man might be illumined to the second writing, since it had been darkened to the first. Therefore, He made a second work after the first, and that was the more evident, since it not only pointed out but illumined. He assumed flesh not losing divinity, and was placed as a book written within and without; in humanity without, within in divinity, so that it might be read without through imitation, within through contemplation.[1]

The works of restoration, centered upon the Incarnation, are the "second writing" of the book of Wisdom. They are, to use the language of the treatise on the moral Ark, the "voice of God" which seeks to recall mankind to the contemplation of inward joys. But they not only call; they enable.

In his existence conditioned by the Fall, however, man sees the world as chaotic and as a succession of times without purpose. Again we should listen to Hugh as he etches the state of the man who has turned from God and now seeks fulfillment of his desires in the world:

> Thus, once it had begun to lose its integrity through its earthly desire, the human heart, which had hitherto kept its stability in cleaving to divine love and remained one in the love of the One, was as it were divided into as many channels as there were objects that it craved, once it had begun to flow in different directions through earthly longings. And that is how it happens that the soul, not knowing how to love its true good, is never able to maintain its stability. Failing to find what it longs for in those things which it has, its desire is always reaching out in pursuit of the unattainable; and so it never has rest. Therefore, from movement without stability is born toil without rest, travel without arrival; . . .[2]

---

[1] I, vi, 5, MPL 176:266D-267A, Def., p. 97f.

[2] A. morl., I, 2, MPL 176:619/20, Sq., p. 47.

Hugh saw the multiple and chaotic nature of man's disordered desires mirrored in the waters of the flood. The waters reflected the endless struggle and the futility of life lived in time under the present conditions of man's state of being. Man sees life as mutable, passing away, never fulfilled, divided and ultimately meaningless. This is the flood from which the Ark delivers man. It has two aspects, one external, the other internal. Externally, the flood symbolizes the flux of time, the ebb and flow of events, moving on endlessly without purpose in an ultimate sense.[1] Internally, the flood as a symbol points to the internal confusion and chaos generated by the divided desires of man as he seeks fulfillment in the present age.[2]

This Victorine valorization of the symbolic content of the flood waters ran counter to the general interpretation found in preceeding generations of commentaries on the Noachic material. For earlier exegetes generally the flood waters had been a type for Christian baptism.[1] The waters were waters of destruction, to be sure, but they destroyed evil in order to prepare for the rebirth of good.[2] In the days of Noah the waters of the flood destroyed the evil humanity of that day, preserving only Noah and his family, and purified the world.[3] So in the time of grace the sacrament of baptism, prefigured by the flood, cleanses man of sin.

---

[1] Cf., e.g., A. morl., IV, 18, MPL 176:677B, Sq., p. 146: "Turning, then, from the works of creation, as from a flood . . ." This aspect of the flood symbolism was developed with much more penetrating acumen in DVM; cf. Bk. II, MPL 176:711ff., Sq., p. 171ff.; and esp. col. 713BC, p. 174. This evaluation of the world always stands in tension with the Hugonian principle that the world as created and in itself can be qualified only as good. Ultimately the disorder of the world is rooted in the disorder within man. Cf. A. morl., IV, 17, MPL 176:676D-677A, Sq., pp. 144-46. Cf. Schlette.

[2] Cf., e.g., ibid., 12, 673A, pp. 138f.: "The desire of this world in the heart of man is as it were the waters of the flood, . . ." Cf. ibid., 16, 675B, p. 143: "Let a man return to his own heart, and he will find there a stormy ocean lashed by the fierce billows of overwhelming passions and desires, . . . For there is this flood in every man, . . ."

This destructive yet cleansing power of the waters of the flood was not present in the treatises on the Ark of Noah. Instead, we find that Hugh viewed the flood waters totally under the aspects of destruction and chaos. There was no possibility of renewal or rebirth from the waters of this flood. It only led to death and destruction. We see a typological element "broken." But it was broken to be "filled" with a new content. The reference was shifted from the order of sacramental typology to psychological and "existential" realities. Thus the flood became the vehicle for a profound and agonized sensitivity to the disorder which Hugh perceived in man and in man's relationship to the world and to God.

---

1. Cf. Danielou, Shadows, pp. 85-102. For an ex. in the tradition, cv. Bede, Hexameron, MPL 91:94D and 97D. Bede also saw a prefiguring of the temptations of this life in the tumult of the flood.

2. The symbolism of water as an element of destruction and regeneration has been presented by M. Eliade in his various studies. Cf. Patterns in Comparative Religion, trans. Rosemary Sheed (Cleveland, 1953), chap. V, esp. pp. 210 ff. on flood symbolism; cf. also The Sacred and the Profane, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York, 1961), pp. 129-32.

3. The Noachic material has been interpreted in light of Near Eastern mythology by Brevard Childs, Myth and Reality in the Old Testament ("Studies in Biblical Theology," no. 27; London, 1960).

In the Ark treatises the vessel which bore Noah and his family through the waters of the flood functioned as the symbolic antithesis of the flood.[1] Unlike the earlier exegetes Hugh was not concerned to correlate the wood of the Ark with the waters of the flood in order to provide a typological foreshadowing of the rite of baptism and the wood of the Cross by which man is saved.[2] For Hugh the wood of the Ark was significant because it floated upon the water. In rising above the rushing, swirling tumult of the flood, the Ark retained stability, floating upon the chaotic elements of destruction. Again, typology in a strict sense was displaced by a concern for other realities.

This stability symbolized by the Ark floating upon the waters of the flood had two points of reference. Like the flood the Ark pointed to an exterior stability and an interior one. There was an Ark of the Church and an Ark of Wisdom.

The exterior Ark, the Ark of the Church, has its stability founded upon the works of restoration which brought the church into being, vivify her now, and will continue to sustain her until the end of time. Within the flux and chaos of the passing moments and ages of time, a path of stability and security may be found in the waters of the flood. This path is marked by the keel of the Ark and is the works of restoration, deeds done in time for the restoration of mankind.

---

[1] Cf., e.g., A. morl., IV, 16, MPL 176:675B, Sq., p. 143: "One only ship of faith, therefore, crosses the sea, one only ark escapes the flood; and, if we would be saved, not only must it be in us, but we must be in it." Also, cf. ibid., 14, 674, p. 141.

[2] For an example of this parallel, cf. Raban Maur, Comm. in Gen., II, 6, MPL 107:515B. Raban quotes Isidore at this point. Also, cf. Danielou, Shadows, pp. 85ff.

The figure of the Ark plowing its way through the stormy waves of the flood is of significance here.[1] From the Time of Tertullian onward this contrast served to indicate the security of salvation within the hierarchical, visible church which administers the sacraments which save. Outside of the Church there is no salvation, just as outside the Ark, no one was saved in the flood. The figure was never without eschatological tension. But for Hugh the historical and eschatological elements came into the fore and the institutional aspect of the symbol dropped far into the background. Hugh spoke of the Ark of the Church buffeted by storms without and racked by noxious gases within, clearly with a static, structured organism in mind. Yet the figure of the Ark of the Church moved basically in a different sphere of thought. The Ark was the mystic Body of Christ, the unity of all believers throughout all the ages of the world. They participate in the saving event of the Incarnate Word by the rich fabric of the sacramental life of the community of believers in each age. At the End, this community will be united about the throne as each member is united with God through Christ. Again and again this historical aspect of the life of the people of God came to focus in the Ark treatises. The Ark represented the historical unfolding of the divine economy in time for the salvation of man. The Church represented by the Ark plowing through the waves was not simply the Church which saves from destruction through the sacraments. It was the community of believers in all ages, mystically united with their common Head, Jesus Christ. It was a community intimately bound up with a history: The history of the works of restoration. This history was limned in the very structure of the Ark, for along the keel the divine dispensation of events and ages was symbolically portrayed.

---

[1] "The Church is herself the ark, which her Noah, our Lord Jesus Christ, the Helmsman and the Haven, is guiding through the tempests of this present life, and leading through Himself unto Himself." A. morl., I, 14, MPL 176:629D, Sq., p. 64; cf. ibid., 10, 626A, p. 59.

The works of restoration were not as clearly defined in the treatises on the Ark as they would be in later works. In De sacramentis christianae fidei and De scripturis et scriptoribus sacris the works were defined as "the Incarnation of the Word with all its sacraments, both those which have gone before from the beginning of time, and those which come after, even to the end of the world."[1] The ark treatises made no explicit reference to sacraments. Instead, they defined the works in terms of foreshadowing and foretelling, and of preaching and believing the Incarnation of the Word.[2] The historical scope of the works of restoration remained the same in the earlier material and in the later, more mature definition. The works occupy the time from creation to consummation. Likewise, the centrality of the Incarnation for the salvation of mankind was present from the earliest formulation. Nevertheless, the

---

[1] DS, I, prol., ii, MPL 176:183C, Def., p. 3. Cf. DSSS XVII, MPL 175:24A.

[2] A. morl., IV, 6, MPL 176:667B, Sq., p. 128: "The Incarnation of the Word, and all those things which, since the beginning preceded the Incarnation either to foreshadow or foretell it, together with those that came after it until the end of the world, with a view to preaching or believing in it."

Ark treatises lacked the more complete and more creative statements of sacramental theology and historical progression which appeared in De sacramentis christianae fidei.

At the one place in De arca Noe morali where the sacraments were related to the works of restoration, Hugh used the word in the older Isidorian sense of "mystery" or "figure."[1] It was a usage found elsewhere in the Ark treatises, to indicate hidden meaning.

Hugh said that just as the Ark was divided into three stories, so also the works of restoration are divided into three classes: Shadow (umbra), body (corpus), and spirit (spiritus): or figure (figura), actuality (res), and truth (veritas).[2] Shadow and figure are to be equated, as are body and actuality, and spirit and truth. The sacraments of the Old Testament were then distinguished from the present sacraments as a prefiguring of something to come:

> Those things are called shadows, which were done before Christ's coming under the natural and the written law, bodily and visibly in order to prefigure the things that now, after His coming, are being done bodily and visibly in the time of grace. They are called shadows because they were both corporal and figures of the corporal. Our sacraments themselves, which are now performed in Holy Church are called the body. And the spirit is that which the grace of God effects invisibly beneath these visible sacraments.[3]

---

[1] On the Isidorian background, cf. Van den Eynde, Essai, p. 71, n. 124.

[2] A. morl., IV, 19, MPL 176:678D-679A, Sq., p. 150.

[3] Ibid., 679A.

Absent in this was the strong Hugonian affirmation that the sacraments of the periods of the natural and written laws were equally efficacious for the salvation of men in those days. The point was made strongly in *De sacramentis*.[1] Of equal importance is the absence in the Ark treatises of Hugh's celebrated definition of the *sacramentum proprie*.[2]

This contrast is displayed unambiguously in the exposition of the sacrament of baptism given in *De arca Noe morali* ~~and~~ in *De sacramentis christianae fidei*. In the Ark treatise Hugh operated totally within the bounds of traditional typological exegesis.[3] The Red Sea, through which the Hebrews passed in the Exodus, was a prefiguring of baptism. As a sacrament baptism signifies "the cleansing from offences which the Holy Spirit effects invisibly within our souls, beneath the washing of our bodies, in this sacrament." Thus the event in sacred history, the Red Sea, was the shadow; baptism, the body; the washing away of sin, the spirit.

---

[1] I, xi, 1, MPL 176:343B, Def., p. 182: "Sacraments were instituted from the beginning for the restoration and guardianship of man, some under the natural law, some under the written law, some under grace . . . . *If anyone, therefore, should deny that prior sacraments had the effect of sanctification, he would not seem to me to think rightly*." (Emphasis mine) Hugh continued by developing the relationship by which the earlier sacraments, as he termed them, conferred sanctification. Cf. Weisweiller, *Wirksamkeit*, pp. 36-38, where the importance of this is clearly indicated and also the opposition to Augustine's understanding of the sacraments of the Old Testament. Cf. Aug., Enarr. in Ps. LXIII, 2, MPL 36:931: "The sacraments of the New Testament give salvation; the sacraments of the Old Testament promise the saviour." Hugh also saw the sacraments of the Old Testament as types of the new dispensation to come; cf. the text cited at the beginning of this note. But--and this is the crux--he saw them as efficacious for salvation in their time as well.

[2] *DS*, I, ix, 2, MPL 176:317C, Def., pp. 154ff. Cf. our earlier discussion of this definition, *supra*, pp. 262 f.

[3] *A. morl.*, IV, 9, MPL 176:679AB, Sq., p. 150.

In De sacramentis, the primary exposition of baptism was not in terms of a typological relationship between sacramenta as either foreshadowings or present sacramental signs.[1] Baptism was related to two previous sacramental actions: Circumcision and oblations. Circumcision, under the written law, and oblations, under the natural law, like baptism under the time of grace, are to be considered efficacious sacraments of "expiation and justification." Hugh was then thinking of an historical progression of sacramental relationships between God and man. And these sacramental relationships were expressed in and determined by the nature of a sacrament as set forth in Hugh's celebrated definition of a sacramentum proprie.

This is not to suggest that Hugh abandoned the use of sacramentum as a "mystery" or that he ceased to use the word in a typological sense. In the midst of discussing baptism, in De sacramentis, Hugh devoted a chapter to the sacraments of the faith to which the catechumens were to be introduced.[2] These sacraments were the magnalia Dei recorded in the Old Testament and they were expounded in light of their typological relationship to the Incarnation and events in the time of grace.

---

[1] I, xi, 8, MPL 176:346A, Def., 185. (Again Deferrari's chap. numbers differ from the Migne text. Deferrari's chap. 8 corresponds to Migne, chap. 6. Deferrari has split Migne chap. 5 into three chaps.)

[2] II, vi, 8, MPL 176:454C-455D, Def., p. 295ff.

Indeed, in this polyvalent use of the word sacrament lies the richness of Hugh's use of the term. It embodied the ancient traditional concept of the great events of salvationhistory and their inner meaning, together with a narrower technical use of the term to signify what may be called the liturgical sacraments of each age in the divine dispensation established for the salvation of mankind. This narrower use of the word was a major advance in the formulation of sacramental theology. In the hands of Hugh of St. Victor, it also enabled a richer and clearer exposition of the positive value of the divine ordinances in every age. Men in each age of history have sustained a saving relationship with God through a life of sacramental participation. That successive stages of sacramental actions have nullified the continuing efficacy of the earlier sacraments points again to the conception of true historical progression in the Victorine conception of the works of restoration.

Hugh's sacramental doctrine as presented in *De sacramentis* showed his profound sense of divine providence and the correlation of God's gracious action in all ages of time for the benefit of mankind. It emerged into full flower after the Ark treatises, but these earlier works contained the ideas in seminal form.

The manner of explicating the efficacy of the Incarnation and passion for the salvation of men in all ages presented a similar advance in the formulation of a conception. In *De arca Noe morali* and *De sacramentis* Christ's sacrifice was presented as efficatious in all ages of time. The ancient just, as well as men of the present age and in the future are saved through Christ. But how is the transhistorical nature of this once-for-all event to be explained?

The Ark treatise set the problem in an exegetical context.[1] How shall one interpret the text, " A Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. 13:8)? The historical specificity of the death of Christ was undeniable. He died, not at the beginning, but at the "end of an age."

> It was at the end of an age that the Son of God came in flesh, suffered Himself to be crucified for man's salvation . . . . The Lamb was slain, therefore, at the end of the world, and He was slain once.[2]

Yet it is this "immolation of the spotless Lamb" which has effected the redemption of the Church, which "began with the beginning of the world."

The exegetical tradition had developed numerous types relating the creation of the Church to the death of Christ. Hugh gathered several of these together to stress the unique bond between the death of Christ and the existence of the Church.

> For the ark was fashioned when the Church's sacraments flowed forth in blood and water from the side of Christ, while he was hanging on the cross. When the Lamb was sacrificed then was the Lamb's Bride born. When Adam slept, then Eve received her form. Our Bridegroom went up to His bridal bed, He slept the sleep of death, He showed forth what availed from the beginning, and did what was done from the beginning.[3]

---

[1] I, 14, MPL 176:630C-631A, Sq., p. 65f.

[2] A. morl., I, 14, MPL 176:630D, Sq., p. 65.

[3] Ibid., 630C.This is a chain of traditional typological motifs foreshadowing the Church. On blood and water from the side of Christ, cf. Bede, Hexameron, MPL 91:89D-90D. (Sq., p. 65, n. 2 suggests Augustine, Contra Faust., XII, 16, MPL 42:263; the ref. in Aug. involves water and baptism only.) On the Adam-Eve type, cf. Augustine, Contra Faust., XII, 8. On the Bridegroom image, cf. Augustine, In Jo. evang. tract., CXX, 2, MPL 34: 1950-51.

Water and blood were types of the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist, while the Bride and Eve both typify the Church in relation to Christ, the Bridegroom and the second Adam.[1]

Hugh's problem lay in relating this historical death to the life of the people of God in all ages. In the Ark treatises this was accomplished by a distinction in the exegesis of the text from Revelation:

> Slain from the beginning--that is, for those who were from the beginning, for the redemption and salvation and reconciliation namely of those who were from the beginning, taking what is said about the beginning as referring not to the time of the slaying but to that of the salvation . . . . For His death was of benefit before it happened; the promise came first, and afterwards the making manifest.[2]

In De arca Noe mystica Hugh developed an elaborate body of iconographical material to accompany the ladders of each of the four ascents. We have considered the major features of this iconography in a previous chapter. In the very terse and compressed language of visual images, Hugh conveyed to the reader the essential characteristics of the means of man's restoration. The ultimate telos of the restoration of man was the contemplative experience, enjoyed in full in heaven, enjoyed in a fleeting sense in this life as an foretaste of the greater joy to come.

---

[1] For the traditional typological relationship between Adam, Christ, and the Church, cf. Danielou, Shadows, pp. 11-56.

[2] A. morl., I, 14, MPL 176:631A, Sq., p. 66.

As we have followed the development of Hugh's thought with respect to the building of the house of wisdom in the heart of man, the fundamental place of the history of man's restoration has been everywhere apparent. To talk about the contemplative life, about the ascension toward the unity which comes from participation in the divine, is to talk at the same time of the approach which God has made to man through the warp and woof of history, and in particular through the Incarnation of the Word. As Hugh said in Book IV of De arca Noe morali,

> They [the elect] mount up from the works of creation, by means of those of restoration, to the Author of creation and of restoration.[1]

This ascension of which Hugh spoke in Book IV of the Ark treatise was a continual interiorization of human consciousness.

> But those ascents must be conceived not outwardly but inwardly as taking place by means of steps within the heart, which go from strength to strength.[2]

The steps within the heart were symbolized in the twelve ladders of the Ark which we shall consider in a moment.

The ascension motif in De arca Noe morali was colored by a strong ascetic tinge, as we would expect of a man committed to the long tradition of monastic spirituality. Yet there was a balance in Hugh's view cultivated under the aegis of the Rule of St. Augustine, and the discipline of the Canons Regular at St. Victor. In "fleeing" the world, the flight was accomplished by means of interior discipline more than by the mere fact of physical removal. As Hugh explained carefully:

---

[1] Chap. 12, MPL 176:672D, Sq., p. 138.

[2] Ibid.

> The divine counsels so often cry to us, urging us to flee the world, not indeed in the sense of going away from this visible earth and sky, but in the sense of not continuing in this world's lust.[1]

If, as we find, the world is cursed in Holy Scripture, "and called the enemy of God," it is "not because the world is evil in itself, but because the beauty of the world leads souls astray."[2] A man ought to flee the lust of the world, because this lust is evil; he ought to flee the "substance" of the world not because this world itself is evil but because the world is the occasion for the exercise of man's disordered will. Always implicit in the Victorine valorization of the world was the Biblical affirmation that the created order was pronounced "good" by the Creator. God has not created an evil world; the world has become the arena of evil through man's evil will. However, along side the Biblical point of view the Platonic/Neoplatonic tendency to reject the world as inferior and actually evil continued to function, but only in a secondary and essentially practical manner.[3] In the final analysis, the proper option is to actually flee the world in the meaning of physical removal; to a greater or lesser degree.[4] Interior detachment is not enough.

---

[1] _Ibid_., 17, 675D-676A, p. 144. [2] _Ibid_., p. 145.

[3] On the Biblical and Platonic/Neoplatonic views, cf. _supra_, pp. 194 ff.

[4] "But, as we have said, it is expedient for us to forget this world, and to blot out its memory from our hearts; lest maybe if we often think of it, we be inclined towards the lust of it." _A. morl._, IV, 17, MPL 176:676D, Sq., p. 146.

Good psychologist that he was, Hugh recognized the difference between objects and attitudes:

> But as far as the things themselves are concerned, everything can be thought about without any sin, for every creature of God is good. Yet again, if we are inclined towards an evil disposition, there is nothing about which we can think, and not sin in so doing.[1]

A man can think well of an evil thing, and evilly of a good thing. It is the will, affectio, amor, which is the final determinant in detachment from the world.

> What matters is not what you think about, but what sort of inclination issues from the thought.[2]

It is the concrete-existential condition of man, qualified by the fact of sin, which necessitates this attitude toward the world. Again, we see the "anthropocentric" approach which characterizes much of Hugh's thought. Hugh's analogy of the attitude of sick men toward food brings this out. Sick men forego certain foods not because the foods are bad in themselves, but because given the current state of health of these individuals, such a food is harmful. So it is with man in his fallen state:

> We too ought to keep the sight of earthly things out of our thought, not as though those things were evil in themselves, but to prevent our soul, which is weak by its own nature, from being further corrupted by remembering them.[3]

---

[1] A. morl., IV, 12, MPL 176:676C, Sq., p. 145.

[2] Ibid., 676D, p. 146. [3] Ibid., 676C, p. 145.

The cure for this illness is found in the works of restoration. They were initiated by God in order to "afford a medicine for the sick." The world, the work of creation, could only "keep a man in health, but it could not make a sick man better."[1]

The contrast between these two works and their respective effects upon those who devote their attention to them was summed up in a series of vignettes, contrasting the "philosophers of the pagans" and the "philosophers of the Christians."[2]

> You must understand, however, that the elect assess the works of God in one way, the reprobate in another. For the elect reckon the works of restoration as superior to those of the first creation, because those were made for bondage, but the former were for our salvation. The reprobate, by contrast, love the works of creation more than those of restoration, because they seek present satisfaction, and not future bliss. The pagan philosophers, in searching out the nature of things with curiosity--that is, in inquiring into the works of creation, have become futile in their thoughts; but Christian sages, by meditating constantly upon the works of restoration, drive every vanity from theirs. The elect, considering their restoration, are kindled with the fire of love divine; the reprobate, with their false love of the loveliness of things created, grow cold in the love of God. The reprobate, immersing their thoughts in transitory things, forget their Creator. But the elect cannot forget Him, whose mercy in their restoration they have constantly in mind. The reprobate, while panting after temporary things, lose their perception of the things eternal; but the elect, while pondering God's temporal benefits, advance to knowledge of the everlasting ones. By visible things the reprobate fall from those that are invisible; but by the visible the elect climb up to the invisible.[3]

---

[1] A. morl., IV, 11, MPL 176:672A, Sq., p. 137. See supra, chap. III, on the two works.

[2] The published English trans. of A. morl. fails to bring out the pointed contrast in Hugh's Latin. The Latin text juxtaposes, in typical Hugonian antithetical parallelism, the philosophi gentilium and the philosophi Christianorum. The English trans. has "pagan philosophers" and "Christian sages;" cf. Sq., p. 137.

[3] A. morl., IV, 11, MPL 176:672BC, Sq., pp. 137f.

Keyed to the notion of the two works, this is the fundamental dialectic between the love of the world (amor mundi) and the love of God (amor Dei).

In the iconography of the Ark, the letters of Adam's name mystically represented the dispersion of humanity over the face of the earth.[1] As the antithesis of this dispersion, the gradually converging superstructure of the Ark represents the process of reunification.[2] On one level and reality the Ark represents drawing together of mankind into the one Body of Christ, the Church. This is the unity of the Ark of Faith, the allegorical Ark.[3] On another level of understanding and reality, the Ark represents the reunification of the dispersed and divided desires of the individual, as he withdraws from the love of the world, which perpetuates this dispersion, and draws near to God through love of Him.[4] This is the formation of the Ark of Wisdom, the tropological

---

1. Cf. A. myst., IV, MPL 176:686AB. Cf., supra, p. --, for discussion of symbolism. This dispersion directly related to the Fall in ibid., VIII, 695D: "After describing the stages of the Fall, Hugh continued: "Thus he [man] was cast forth to the four parts of the world and was dissipated."

2. Cf. A. morl., IV, 10, MPL 671D-672A, Sq., p. 137: "So, then, when God by speaking with the few . . . draws our hearts to unity, and by speaking darkly and in secret draws them upwards to Himself, what else is He doing--if I may so say--but producing in our hearts the form of an invisible ark?"

3. Cf. A. myst., VIII, 695D. After describing the Fall and the dispersion of humanity over the earth as the result, Hugh continued: "Since now he has been gathered together and recalled, he comes from the four parts of the earth to the Ark, which is the Church, . . ."

4. Cf. Ibid., IV, 4,666BC, p. 126: "Then we shall be able to see in a spiritual manner the form of our ark, which was broad at the bottom, and narrowed gradually as it rose, till at the peak it came to measure a single cubit only. In the same way, as we rise from out of this deep . . . we grow steadily in the virtues as by certain ordered stages in our hearts, and we are gradually drawn towards a unity, until we attain even to that simple oneness, that true simplicity, and everlasting changelessness, that is in God."

Ark, which is erected in the heart of man from right, pure, and profitable thoughts.[1] On both of these levels the Ark bodies forth the essential elements of the Christian life involving on the one hand, the corporate life of the Christian community and on the other the inner development of the members of that community.[2] Each is a reflection of the other, for, as Hugh commented:

> There is in a certain sense only one ark everywhere, for there is one only common ground of likeness everywhere, and that which is not different in nature ought not to be different in name. The form is one, though the matter is different, for that which is actualized in the wood [Noah's Ark] is actualized also in the people [the Ark of the Church], and that which is found in the heart [the Ark of Wisdom] is the same as that which is found in charity [the Ark of mother grace].[3]

If the Ark of Wisdom is to be built of right, profitable, and necessary thoughts, and if the bounds of these thoughts are to be sought within the limits of the works of restoration, it now behooves us to follow Hugh as he sketches out the manner in which these thoughts are to be "built up" into the form of an Ark. In Book IV of _De arca Noe morali_ the place of the works of restoration and the nature of the ascension to be made were sketched by Hugh. In Book II we find the ascension theme developed more fully as Hugh correlated the Ark of Noah with the themes of the mountain of the Lord and the four ascents.

---

[1] Cf. _Ibid._, II, 1, 635B, p. 73: "Let us therefore have right thought, let us have pure and profitable thoughts, for of such material we shall build our ark." Cf. _Ibid._, 8, 639D f., p. 81 f., for the hierarchy of right, profitable, and necessary thoughts.

[2] The two aspects are brought into the closest possible connection in _A. myst._, VIII, MPL 176:695D. "Since now he has been gathered together and recalled, he comes from the four parts of the earth to the Ark, which is the Church, and afterwards slowly ascends upward, drawing himself into a unity, until he reaches the summit."

[3] _A. morl._, I, 11, MPL 176:626C, Sq., p. 60.

That the mountain theme should appear is no surprise. Moses' ascension on Sinai was used by Dionysius as a symbol of the via negativa issuing in the mystic experience.[1] The pyramidal form of the Ark suggested a mountain in its very shape.[2] And the role of the mountain of the Lord, i.e. Zion, in the eschatological texts of Isaiah and other prophetic books would be apparent to a mind nourished on the discipline of lectio divina.[3]

The notion of ascension coalesces, as it were, about two texts taken from Isaiah, both of which point to the coming New Day when Jerusalem shall be restored and the people of the nations will stream to the house of the Lord.[4]

---

[1] Cf. supra, p. 169 and infra, p. 348.

[2] On the mountain as a universal symbol of the point of contact of "interchange" between the human and the divine, cf. Eliade, Patterns, pp. 99-102 and Cosmos and History. The Myth of the Eternal Return (New York,1959), pp. 12-17.

[3] On the eschatological notions of the various authors of the Book of Isaiah and also the other prophetic books, cf. G. van Rad, Old Testament Theology, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (2 vols.; Edinburgh, 1965), II, 99-125, 147-75, and 238-62. Cf. also J. Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel (Philadelphia, 1962), pp. 360-75.

[4] Many of the Psalms also incorporate vivid portrayals of Jerusalem as the sacred cultic center and goal of the aspirations of the pious Hebrew, journeying to the great feasts or entering the Temple precincts. Cf. the use of Ps. 132 which follows. On the use of Psalms in the liturgy, cf. Batiffol, History, chaps. I-III esp.

> It shall come to pass in the latter days
>   that the mountain of the house of the
>   Lord
> shall be established as the highest of the
>   mountains,
>   and shall be raised above the hills;
> and all the nations shall flow to it, (Is. 2:2)[1]
>
> I will bring your offspring from the
>   east,
>   and from the west I will gather you;
> I will say to the north, Give up,
>   and to the south, So not withhold: (Is. 43:5-6)[2]

For a mind attuned to liturgical themes, such passages evoked a foreshadowing of the liturgical cult celebrated daily by the brethren in the Abbey and also a foreshadowing of the celestial liturgy celebrated by the saints. Having introduced the theme of the mountain and the ascensions into the Ark treatise, and after reflecting upon the role of Christ the Mediator who is both model and medicine for those ascending, Hugh broke into a paean of praise which fused Biblical, liturgical, and eschatological themes into a vital unity:

---

[1] Cf. A. morl., II, 9, MPL 176:640D, Sq., p. 83.

[2] Ibid., 641B, p. 84.

> Let us go up, therefore, putting all obstacles behind us. Let us go up with joy, for we are going "into the house of the Lord." [cf. Ps. 122:1] Let us, the tribes of Isarel, go up with joy to the feast of our heavenly fatherland, to praise the name of the Lord amid the towers of Jerusalem.[1]

This goal of rapturous experience was not to be won without toil and effort, and to the remote beginnings of this pilgrimage we must now turn.

Hugh spoke of four ascents, ordered in succession. We have already considered the iconographical representation of these series of ladders in the drawing of the Ark.[2] Now they will be considered from the standpoint of the view of the contemplative life which they portray.

If we look for the place of the consideration of the works of restoration in this series of ascents, we will find meditation upon Scripture, which itself has as its unique subject the works of restoration, tucked away as the second ladder of the third ascent.[3] But this is to take a narrow view of the role of the works of restoration. The entire panorama of the "steps in the ascents, whereby we climb to heaven,"[1] was molded and shaped by images and metaphors drawn from the Bible.[2] Hugh's view, like that of claustrales generally, was permeated by the language and ethos of Scripture.[3] The monastic discipline provided an environment which would nurture this. The great sacramental mysteries of the Church's history were celebrated in the yearly cycle of the liturgy while private reading, collations, sermons, the daily reading in the refectory, and the lectionary drawn from the wealth of patristic erudition provided a constant array of sources rooted and grounded in the Bible.[4]

---

[1] A. morl., II, 9, MPL 176:641CD, Sq., p. 84. In connection with this, recall the four-fold interpretation of the word Jerusalem given by Guibert of Nogent in "How to Make a Sermon," quoted supra, pp. 43 f. "Jerusalem is a certain city, historically speaking; allegorically, it represents holy church; tropologically . . . it is the faithful soul of anyone who sighs for a vision of eternal peace; anagogically, it means the life of the heavenly citizens who see theGod of gods when his face is revealed in Zion." The Church building itself was thought of "mystically and liturgically, as an image of heaven." Cf. Simson, Gothic, p. 8, who also notes the repeated parallels of the two in the Office for the Day of Dedication cf. p. 129, n. 102; cf. Andrieu, Le Pontifical romain au XII^{e} siècle, pp. 192f. Cf. the several Sequences by Adam of St. Victor entitled Dedicatio Ecclesiae, text and trans., Wrangham, I, 136-61. The holy mount, the heavenly Jerusalem and a whole host of types of the Church are found in these magnificent examples of liturgical poetry.

[2] Cf. supra, chap. II.

[3] Cf. A. morl., II, 10, MPL 176:642B, Sq., p. 86: "The third ascent is from the cold of the west, . . . then we shall be free to give ourselves up gladly to meditation, and to the teaching of Divine Scripture, . . ."

The four ascents were conceived by Hugh in a direct relationship to the nature of man as vitiated by the Fall.[5] The first three ascents were movements away from the three guilts acquired in the Fall: Pride, concupiscence, and ignorance. The fourth ascent was not a movement away from vice, but rather an ever closer approach to true virtue, charity.

These ascents also fall into the rhythm of one of the major contemplative patterns of the medieval period. They pass through successive stages of purgation, illumination, and union, a pattern bequeathed to the Middle Ages by Dionysius the pseudo-Areopagite.[1] Hugh has, however, added a fourth stage. The first stage is not one of purgation, but is better termed "awakening" in line with the terminology proposed by Miss Evelyn Underhill.[2] So we have the sequence of awakening, purgation, illumination, and union in the succession of ascensions in the Ark treatises.[3] This motif was overlooked by Mignon in his study of Hugh's mysticism, for he writes:

---

[1] A. morl,, II, 10, MPL 642A, Sq., p. 85.

[2] Cf. R. Javelet, "Au XII^{e} siècle, l'Écriture sainte servante de la mystique?" RSR, XXXVII (1963), 354-69.

[3] Cf. the superb study by Leclercq, LLDG, esp. chaps. V and VI.

[4] Cf. our comments, supra chap. I, concerning the liturgy, etc.

[5] Cf. our consideration of this supra, chap. II in connection with the iconography.

> Mystical authors commonly distinguish, in the soul which aspires to perfection, three degrees, the purgative way, the illuminative way, and the unitive way, analogous to the three states noted by Saint Thomas, incipientium, proficientium, et perfectorum. This division borrowed from the Areopagite was known to our Victorine, who states it in his Commentaire sur la Hierarchie celeste [lib. VIII, col. 1078]; but it ought to be added that Hugh appears not to have sought to order his ascetical doctrine according to these three elements.[4]

---

[1] Cf. Petry, Late Medieval Mysticism, pp. 33 ff, for a consideration of Dionysius and his influence. On Dionysius, cf. the important study by Roques, Univers, chap. III, esp. pp. 94-100. Cf. also, Gandillac, Oeuvres complètes, introd., pp. 32 ff. For Dionysian influence on Hugh cf. Baron, Sci. et Sg., pp. 171 ff. and Études, pp. 133-218, conclusions, pp. 215-18; also, Weisweiller, "Sacramentum fidei," "Sakrament als Symbol und Teilhabe," and "Die Ps.-Dionysiuskommentare."

[2] Cf. Mysticism. A study in the nature and development of Man's spiritual consciousness (Cleveland, 1955), pp. 169 f. for the classification of the five stages of the mystic path (awakening, purgation, illumination, dark night of the soul, and union) and pp. 176 ff. on awakening. Hugh's descriptions lack the element of a "single and abrupt conversion" which Miss Underhill designates as a leading aspect. (p. 178) Better for Hugh is her statement, "All conversion entails . . . the consequent remaking of the field of consciousness, an alteration in the self's attitude to the world." (p. 177)

[3] Underhill's "dark night of the soul" is a characteristic of the mystic way which is not prominent in Hugh's thought. But the intermittent nature of the contemplative experience is affirmed; cf. De arrha animae, ed. Müller, p. 25, Herbert, pp. 35 f. Cf. Underhill, Mysticism pp. 380 ff.

[4] Les origines, II, 363.

The only schematic from the Ark treatises which gained his attention was that of the growth of the Tree of Wisdom in Book III.[1] Baron also expounds the sequence of steps in the growth of the Tree without taking note of the other important pattern in the Ark treatises.[2]

The first two ascensions involve, as we shall see, the process of turning from the vices of the world and adhering to the virtues. Only after having so purified himself is a man ready to seek knowledge. This was the ancient traditional ascetic pattern of Eastern monasticism as passed to the West by Cassian, and derived by him from Evagrius.[3] Moral discipline and the struggle against the vices bore the name πρακτική; it was the active life for Cassian and the East.[4] The stage of knowledge and contemplation was θεωρητική. Only by the moral discipline of the active life (πρακτική) can one prepare himself for the contemplative life (θεωρητική). There are differences in the details of the respective patterns, but the spiritual discipline commended by Hugh of St. Victor to the brethren moved in the same cadences as that of the Eastern fathers and their Western followers. Ascetic renewal and the virtuous life are preconditions for true knowledge.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, 368; cf. *A. morl.*, II, 15,MPL 176:646C, Sq., p. 93. for the outline of Book III.

[2] Cf. *Sci. et Sg.*, pp. 163 ff.

[3] Cf. *supra*, pp. 269 f. and 296.

[4] In the West generally the "active" life came to mean not the ascetic discipline of mastering the vices, but the active involvement in "external" concerns, as contrasted to the interior withdrawal of the "contemplative" life. Cf. Butler, *Western Mysticism*, pp. 157-223, on the contrast in the writings of Augustine, Gregory, and Bernard. Cf. Gregory, Hom. in Ez., II, ii, 7-8: "There are two lives . . . the active and the contemplative. The active life is: to give bread to the hungry, to teach . . . to correct . . . to tend the sick . . . and to provide those entrusted to us with the means of subsistence. But the contemplative life is: to retain indeed with all one's mind the love of God and neighbour, but to rest from exterior action, and cleave only to the desire of the Maker, . . ." Cf. Gregory, *Mor. in Job*, VI, 56-61. Hugh takes the same view in *A. morl.* II, 3-5, MPL 176:366B-368D, Sq., pp. 75 ff., where he distinguishes going out by action and going out by contemplation; both of these are contrasted with "the silence of inward contemplation."

The restoration of man has its inception with the awakening of the soul, which has so turned away from its inner nature that it has forgotten its true nature and its true good.[2] Awakening begins with fear (*timor*), progresses through grief (*dolor*), and culminates with the arousing of love (*amor*).[3] Fear arises from the fear of God's judgment, but "in teaching us to fear danger, it makes us love safety."[4] So fear is not simply a negative quality; it gives birth in man to the desire for what God promises.[5]

Having been awakened to the existence of spiritual goods, man now begins to mourn his present misery and fate in the world. This is grief (*dolor*), the second ladder of the first ascent. Next to this ladder in the Ark drawing Hugh drew the line of Hebrews being led into exile. So the Babylonian exile serves as a type for the exile of man in this life as he longs for the true fatherland, the heavenly Jerusalem. As the Hebrews lamented their exile, so man grieves for his present one.

---

[1] Cf. *Did.*, III, 12 and 13, Butt., pp. 61 ff., Tay., pp. 94 ff.

[2] Cf. the description of the forgetfulness of the soul and its engrossment in the world in *Did.*, I, i, Butt., pp. 4 ff., Tay., pp. 46 ff.

[3] *A. myst.*, X, MPL 176:697C.

[4] *A. morl.*, III, 1, MPL 176:647B, Sq., p. 94. Fear of divine judgment also awakens faith; ibid., 4, 649B f., pp. 97 ff.

[5] Cf. Hugh's analysis of the four fears in *DS*, II, xiii, 5, MPL 176:528, Def., pp. 377 f. Again, Hugh's psychological interests are shown to good advantage.

Following grief, one mounts to love (amor), as fear gives birth to the "desire (diligo) of future glory."[1] The iconography of this level associated amor with both eschatological longing and the Bride/ Bridegroom imagery drawn from the Song of Songs which was so influential in medieval spirituality. The figure of the virtue was that of "one of the virgins with a glowing lamp and a vase of oil, is expecting the coming of the Bridegroom."[2] The gospel parable was one of eschatological longing; the Bridegroom touches off a correlation with one of the major contemplative themes. The theme of the mystic nuptials, based on the Song of Songs, was a theme developed more fully in Hugh's later works. De arrha animae, De laude charitatis, and De amore sponsi ad sponsam show a sustained and profound reflection upon the nature of love and the reformation of man by "the gradual invasion of the soul by charity."[3]

The Bridegroom imagery served Hugh not only as a motif of the consummation of the contemplative quest. In De arca Noe morali the Christ, the Bridegroom, was presented as coming to call men to Himself, awakening them to the desire for spiritual realities and the longing for the consummation of the contemplative life in the visio Dei.[1] The passage shows the same outpouring of affective language which marks the later treatises on the Bridegroom theme and in praise of charity.

---

[1] A. myst., MPL 176:693B.

[2] Ibid., 693C.

[3] Squire, SSW, p. 28.

The second ascent, corresponding to the initial stage of the traditional triad of purgation, illumination, and union, progressed through the stages of submissiveness (patientia) mercy (misericordia) and compunction (compunctio).[2] Submissiveness centered upon penitential practices. Along the ladder were written the words, "Here those ascend who mortify their members by abstinence and affliction, . . ."[3] The second ladder continued the penitential discipline, but shifted the emphasis to concern for others: "Here ascend those who by the giving of alms and other works of mercy atone for (redimunt) past sins."[4]

The final stage of the ascent from concupiscence was that of compunction. This virtue Hugh described as an action which,

> penetrates the soul of our hearts like a sharp stake; like a fire it burns up our corruption, and it dispels our darkness like a blaze of light . . . . By a zeal for compunction our hearts are cleansed of every earthliness, . . .[5]

Compunction is the last and greatest effort of purification. Hugh likened it to the digging of wells by the Patriarchs.[6] As they sought life-giving water; so the Christian, living water of wisdom. By compunction,

---

[1] Cf. A. morl., IV, 9, MPL 176:669 f., Sq., pp. 132 ff.; based on Song of Songs 2:9-12.

[2] Cf. A. myst., X, MPL 176:697C.

[3] A. myst., VII, MPL 176:694B. [4] Ibid., 694C.

[5] A. morl., III, 6, MPL 176:652CD, Sq., p. 103.

[6] Ibid., 652D. Cf. Gen. 21:15-30; 24:15-33.

> we must dig deep wells in our hearts, casting out all our earthliness, that we may find the hidden treasures and the secret channel of the living waters.[1]

In its remote Greek origins, compunction was a medical term designating attacks of acute pain of a physical nature.[2] Transformed in Christian usage, it came to mean a spiritual "pain", a perpetual affliction of sorrow and tears rising from consciousness of sin.[3] A second use was attached to the word, whereby it had the wider sense of penitance, especially in early monastic literature.[4] Cassian bequeathed both of these uses to the Latin west. Compunction is, on the one hand, the "violent affections" whereby God agitates the soul, and issues in either "ineffable joy" or "sorrow so vivid that it gives rise to an effusion of tears."[5] On the other hand, compunction can be an habitual attitude, situated in a ladder of the virtues, being the daughter of fear and the mother of detachment.[6] Gregory the Great, along with

---

1. *A. morl.*, III, 6, MPL 176:652D, Sq., p. 103.

2. Cf. Leclercq, *LLDG*, p. 38, and J. Pegon, "Componction," *Dict. de Spir.*, II, ii, 1312-21, with bibliography. The analysis which follows in this paragraph is based on Leclercq and Pegon.

3. Cf. Origen, *Homil. in Jer.*, XX; cited Pegon, col. 1313.

4. Cf. Pegon, col. 1314.

5. Cf. *Conf.*, IX, 26 f., ed. Pichery, II, 62 f.

6. Cf. *Inst.* IX, 10 f.

Augustine, gave the concept its widest diffusion, retaining the traditional usage and sharpening it somewhat.[1] Compunction was "an act by which God awakens us, a shock, a blow,"[2] resulting from the consciousness of sin and a longing for spiritual goods. Such a divine "goad" presses man to purification.

Hugh's use of compunction attached itself strongly to the penitential aspect of the term, leaving the rousing of fear and tears to the earlier stages of the ascension from pride. Such a shift was also indicated in the Sentences of Peter the Lombard where compunction became one of the three elements in the sacrament of penance.[3] This reflects the increasing systematization of penitential discipline in the early medieval period.[4] In the case of Hugh, the emphasis upon penitential discipline reflects not only this development,[5] but also the climate of St. Victor, an abbey strongly committed to the Cistercian ideal of monastic reform and discipline.

---

[1] Cf. Pegon, col. 1315.

[2] Leclercq, LLDG, p. 38.

[3] Cf. Sent., IV, xvi, 1, where penance is analyzed as compunctio cordis, confessio oris, and satisfactio operis. Cf. discussion by Pegon, col. 1316.

[4] Cf. Ghellinck, MT, p. 455, speaking of the "larger place taken in all groups of [canon law] collections by theological subjects and expecially by penitential questions." Cf. ibid., 457ff. on the treatise De paenitentia in Gratian's Decretum.

[5] In DS Hugh devoted an entire treatise to questions of penitential discipline; cf. II, 14, MPL 176:549 ff., Def., pp. 401 ff. Def. title reads "On Confession;" Migne reads "De Confessione et poenitentia et remissione peccatorum."

This emphasis upon penitential discipline and the elimination of vice in connection with purification was carried into Hugh's Commentary on the Celestial Hierarchies of Dionysius the pseudo-Areopagite.[1] Such an emphasis was in striking contrast to the Dionysian notion of purification. For Denys and for Hugh purification in the angelic realm meant simply increase in knowledge, i.e. overcoming the relative ignorance which the angels have at their creation--for they are perfect only in the sense of initial perfection. In connection with man's purification Denys joins a similar emphasis upon knowledge and instruction, including the elimination of false images, to a concern for moral regeneration. Purification on the human level retains "a sharply accented gnoseological aspect."[2] For Hugh, however, human purification has nothing to do with knowledge and truth. It is a purification from the corruption of evil by release from sins; an elimination of evil followed by a consummation of the good. Hugh emphasized the contrast between the need of the angels for knowledge alone and the need on man's part for a moral regeneration.[3] Here, as elsewhere in the Commentary Hugh presents a point of view which is "psychological, moral, practical, (and) affective," a point of view not emphasized as sharply in the Dionysian corpus, which retains a point of view objective, hierarchical, and "cosmic."[4]

---

[1] Cf. the excellent analysis of this point in Roques, "Connaissance de Dieu," pp. 306-08. On the Dionysian position, cf. idém, Univers, pp. 94 ff., 164 ff., and 192 ff. The relevant portions of Hugh's In hier. are MPL 176:1044BD and 1051C-1053B.

[2] Roques, "Connaissance de Dieu," p. 308.

[3] Cf. In hier., 1044BC (trans. Roques, p. 307).

[4] Roques, "Connaissance de Dieu," p. 325.

In De institutione novitiorum a similar emphasis upon moral discipline pervades the entire work.[1] The commendation of lectio divina to the novices, for instance, is couched entirely in terms of ascetic discipline and the role of Scripture in inciting to the love of God and contempt for the world.[2]

If compunction represented the culmination of the disciplines of awakening and purification, it also formed the vital link between these and the next ascent which was made "from ignorance" and partakes of the nature of illumination. Purification has its goal in preparation for knowledge, and marks the active beginning of the quest for knowledge, for virtue and knowledge are really inseparable:

> Compunction enkindles the mind which, thus enkindled, is enlightened and, when it is enlightened, then ignorance is dispelled. And when ignorance is dispelled, then truth is manifested, and when truth is manifested, wisdom shoots, and with the shooting up of wisdom the treasure is found.[3]

The "treasure" harkens back to an immediately preceeding exposition of the gospel parable likening the kingdom of God to a treasure hidden in a field. (Matt. 13:44 ff.) This is a critical passage in De arca Noe morali, for it introduces the correlation between the image of God in man and the primal contemplative experience.[1] Hugh expounded the text allegorically in the following manner:

---

[1] Cf. MPL 176:925 ff. for text. Van den Eynde, Essai, p. 114, comments that De inst. is a "work eminently practical and interested in the many details of the daily life of the canons regular." De inst. is definitely part of the Hugonian corpus, despite reservations by Glorieux and Hauréau. Cf. Baron, Sci. et Sg., pp. vii-xxxi, esp. p. xxviii, and "Hugues de Saint-Victor est-il l'auteur d'un Commentarie de la Règle de saint Augustin?" RechSR, XLIII (1955), 350, n. 28, on De inst. The authenticity of the Commentary is less secure, with decisive evidence neither for or against it; cf. ibid., p. 360. Baron inclines toward authenticity.

[2] Cf. De inst., VIII, MPL 176:933D-934A. Hugh speaks of the "love of God (amor Dei) . . . which quickly inflames the heart through the ardor of compunction."

[3] A. morl., III, 6, MPL 176:652C, Sq., p. 102. The first sentence of this passage is not found in the Migne text, but it is contained in the text collated by Mierow, "A Description," p. 49, col. 652 at line 39.

> The kingdom of heaven is of course eternal life. But Christ is life eternal, Christ is also wisdom, and wisdom is the treasure. And this treasure was hidden in the field of the human heart when man was created in the image and likeness of his Maker. For the heart of man was so created that from it, as from His mirror, the divine wisdom should be reflected back, and that which of itself could not be seen should in His image be made visible.[2]

The image of God meant, for Hugh, that man was created with the possibility,

> always to see in himself the face of God, and through contemplation to have Him ever present.[3]

The loss of this contemplative experience was likewise expounded via the allegorical interpretation of a Biblical text. For this, Hugh took the narrative of the completion of the Solomonic Temple, when a cloud filled the Temple so that the priests could not minister. (I Kings 8:10 f.) Following the "house-text" tradition, Hugh saw in the building of the Temple a type of the work of the divine wisdom in making the heart of man, "that in it God might dwell as in a temple." The cloud which filled the house upon its completion was interpreted as the ignorance which results from man's sin:

---

[1] The notion of the imago Dei as the mirror in which man contemplates God is important in the Eastern tradition. Cf. the analysis of this theme in Gregory of Nyssa by J. Maréchal, Études sur la Psychologie des Mystiques ("Museum Lessianum, sec. phil.," nos. 2 [2nd ed.] and 19; Paris, 1938 and 1937), II, 102 ff. The Augustinian use of the imago as the presence in the soul of triads reflecting the Trinity is also found in Hugh's work; cf. DS, I, iii, 21, MPL 176:225BD, Def., pp. 50 f. On Augustine, cf. Portalié, Guide, pp. 129 ff., and in particular Schmaus, Die Psychologische Trinitatslehre, pp. 195 ff. All in all, it must be said of Hugh's doctrine of the imago Dei that, "Hugh does not express himself clearly in his major works concerning the image and similitude, explicating things much too briefly and insufficiently." Lasić, Théologia perfectiva, p. 102.

[2] A. morl., III, 6, MPL 176:651D-652A, Sq., p. 102.

[3] Ibid., 652A.

> But this house, when it is built, is filled with a cloud. For man, once created and by his sin falling away from the vision [specula] of inward contemplation, has sunk down into the wretched darkness of this present life, in which he cannot worthily serve God, because he is so wrapped around with the darkness of ignorance . . . .[1]

The dispersion of this cloud is initiated by compunction and carried nearer to completion by the "ascent from ignorance," composed of thinking (cogitatio), meditation (meditatio), and contemplation (contemplatio).[2] This ascent culminated in the reforming and refashioning of the divine likeness in man. All of the potential resources of human capacity were to be mobilized in effecting this end. Bearing in mind the comprehensive nature of philosophy, embracing "secular" and "sacred" readings, in the Victorine climate, we find Hugh proposing in the Didascalicon that:

> This the, is what the arts are concerned with, this is what they intend, namely to restore within us the divine likeness, . . .[3]

> From this it can be inferred, as said above, that the intention of all human actions is resolved in a common objective: either to restore in us the likeness of the divine image (divinae imaginis similitudo) or to take thought for the necessity of this life, . . .[4]

---

[1] A. morl., III, 6, MPL 176:652BC, Sq., pp. 102 f.

[2] A. myst., X, MPL 176:697C.

[3] Book I, 1, Butt., p. 23, Tay., p. 61.

[4] Ibid., 7, Butt. p. 15, Tay., p. 54.

Chatillon sees in the role given to knowledge in the restoration of the image of God in man the originality and the grandeur of the Victorine abbey. While proposing a monastic discipline equal to that of Citeaux or Premontre, the Victorines joined to this a vital sense of the proper, and necessary, place of a comprehensive knowledge.[1] Nevertheless, it remains true that the final penetrating thrust of the contemplative experience belongs to love, and not to the understanding, which "remains outside."[2]

With the triad of cogitatio, meditatio, contemplatio we reach one of the most famous Victorine schemas, Expanded to five members by inserting oratio and operatio following meditatio it appeared in the Didascalicon.[3] In the first Homily on Ecclesiastes the triad, expounded with subtle differentiations, provided the structure for a profound and moving reflection on the nature of the contemplative experience.[4]

The iconography of this ascent conveyed with precision the basic elements of the illuminative experience. The central iconographic figure was a vase. Ignorance was shown shattering the vase against a rock, for she "through various errors destroys the integrity of the soul."[1] The face of ignorance was veiled, recalling the obscuring function of the smoke in the Temple mentioned just above. To restore the integrity of the soul was the purpose of this third ascent of the Ark.

---

[1] Cf. the introduction to his ed. of Richard of Saint-Victor, Liber exceptionum, pp. 2 f.; cf. also the review of same, by R. Javelet, RSR, XXXV (1961), 68.

[2] Cf. Baron, Sci. et Sg., pp. 212 ff.

[3] Cf. Bk. V, chap. 9, Butt., pp. 109 f., and Tay., pp. 132 f. The first term is lectio, not cogitatio, but the essential meaning is the same.

[4] Cf. MPL 175:116 ff., Sq., pp. 183 ff.

Lectio divina played a major role in this third ascent. Characterizing the ascent in *De arca Noe morali*, Hugh said:

> When through abstinence and the practice of discipline we have extinguished in ourselves the passions of the flesh, then we shall be free to give ourselves up gladly to meditation, and to the teaching of Divine Scripture, so that by applying ourselves to reading and to meditation the eye of our mind may once more be enlightened, . . .[2]

The illumining function of Scripture is of utmost importance. For Scripture contains the record of the mighty deeds of God, the works of restoration, which have been accomplished--or remain to be fulfilled--in all the ages of history. The works of restoration are an "outward cry" of God to man; Scripture is the means whereby this call is presented to each man.

Scripture is not only the "call" of God; Scripture is also the "mirror" in which the soul may see her image and discover the proper vestments in preparation for the heavenly nuptials of contemplative fulfillment.[3] In Scripture one may "read the explanation of what is happening to [him]" in the process of restoration.[4] This "explanation" of the work of grace is read particularly via the elucidation of the mystical sense of the Biblical text by allegory and tropology. Hugh found the Fall of man and the fate of man apart from the redeeming activity of God adumbrated in the perigrinations of the Hebrews, first into Egypt, next from Egypt to the Promised Land, and finally from the Promised Land into Babylonian Exile.[1] The "mystery" of the creation of light was expounded in De sacramentis christianae fidei in terms of the state of man and the manner of his restoration.[2] And we may suspect that if Hugh had completed his promised treatise on the desert wanderings of the Hebrews and the forty-two resting places in the desert he would have found therein the pattern of the contemplative life, just as Origen had done centuries before.[3]

---

[1] *A. myst.*, IX, MPL 176:697A.

[2] Book II, chap. 10, MPL 176:642B, Sq., p. 86.

[3] Cf. *De arrha animae*, ed. Müller, p. 21, Herbert, p. 31. Cf. *Expositio in Reg. b. Aug.*, MPL 176:924, where the exposition is commended as a mirror, and then Scripture is given a similar function as a guide for the canons.

[4] Squire, *SSW*, p. 35.

Returning again to the context of the iconography of the third ascent, we find the representation of knowledge (cognitio) facing a book open to the first verse of Genesis: "In the beginning God created heaven and earth." This means, says Hugh, that "the first knowledge of God is found in creatures."[4] This introduces us to an important theme in Hugh's thought, the world as a symbol manifesting the divine nature.[5] Yet man

---

1. A. morl., IV, 18, MPL 176:678AB, Sq., p. 148.

2. Book I, i, 12, MPL 176:195D-197B, Def., pp. 16 ff.

3. Cf. A. myst., XIV, MPL 176:700BC. On Origen, cf. Hanson, Allegory and Event, pp. 254 f.; W. Völker, Das Vollkommenheitsideal des Origenes (Tübingen, 1931), esp. pp. 62-78; and R. Le Daut and J. Lécuyer, Exode (chez Origene), Dict. de Spir., IV, ii, 1976 ff.

4. Cf. A. myst., VII, MPL 176:693CD.

5. Cf. supra, pp. 249 ff.

cannot perceive the meaning of this symbol without the purifying and illumining power of the works of restoration.[1] It is Scripture, again which leads man first to the proper comprehension of the world and its symbolic reality.[2]

Meditation was depicted gathering up the broken fragments of the vase, thus effecting the beginning of the reunification of the soul of man.[3] Thought, the first level of the ascent, has provided man with necessary insights concerning God, man, and the universe. The task of meditation is to make this knowledge take effect in life. It seeks the way to "fulfill what you have learned must be done."[4] Cogitation corresponds to the right thoughts of which the Ark is built, for they are gained by reflection upon the Scriptures, the lives of the saints, and the world. Meditation, however, may be likened to useful thoughts, for thought becomes useful only when the knowledge which has been amassed is effectively carried into action by the cultivation of the virtues.[1]

---

[1] Cf. De trib. dieb., IV, MPL 176:814BD, and our discussion of same, supra, pp. 251-52. Also, cf. DS, I, vi, 5, MPL 176:266D-267A, Def., p 97: "The work of wisdom was a book written without. But He willed afterwards that it still be written otherwise without, that wisdom might be seen more manifestly and be recognized more perfectly, that the eye of man might be illumined to the second writing, since it had been darkened to the first." The second work, the Incarnation, "not only pointed out but illumined."

[2] Hugh has no natural theology. Even the arguments for the existence of God in DS, I, iii, 6 ff., must be placed in the context of faith: DS, I, iii, 31, MPL 176:234C, "Human reason unless it has been illumined by the word of God cannot see the way of truth." Hugh's arguments were, it is true, developed in the later tradition and by Richard of St. Victor, as necessary reasons. Cf. Copleston, History, II, 176 ff. For Hugh, all knowledge of God presupposes a prior relationship to God, as pointed out by Schlette, Nichtigkeit, p. 132-35.

[3] A. myst., IX, MPL 176:697A.

[4] Did., V, 9, Butt., pp. 109-10, Tay., p. 132.

The final step in the third ascent was contemplation. This was represented as a craftsman melting down the gathered fragments of the vase and liquefying them. The liquid was then shown running through a duct into the cubit crowning the Ark. The "mystery" of this was explained by Hugh:

> Contemplation, having liquefied it [the vase] transforms it by the fire of divine love [*per ignem divini amoris*], reforming it in the image [*in monetam*] of the divine likeness [*divinae similitudinis*].[2]

Thus the total reintegration of man's true personhood, formed in the divine likeness and fractured by the Fall, was initiated in the illuminative ascent. The refashioning of the image of God leads us to the Eastern mystical tradition, as exemplified in Gregory of Nyssa's *De opificio hominis*, which Hugh may have known in the translation of Erigenia.[3] The themes of the fire of divine love and liquefaction lead to the pseudo-Dionysius and to Hugh's first *Homily on Ecclesiastes*.

---

[1] On right and useful thoughts, cf. *A. morl.*, II, 8, MPL 176:639D f., Sq., p. 81.

[2] *A. myst.*, IX, MPL 176:697B.

[3] For text, cf. MPG 44:125-256. Eng. trans. H. A. Wilson, in *NPNF*, 2nd ser., V. 387-428. Kirschberger, *Richard of Saint-Victor*, p. 47 thinks Richard may have known the work. On Gregory's doctrine, cf. Quaesten, *Patrology*, III, 291 ff., with bibliography; G. B. Ladner, *The Idea of Reform*; J. Daniélou, *Platonisme et Théologie mystique. Doctrine spirituellé de saint Grégoire de Nysse*. ("Théologie, "vol. II; Paris, n.d.); and Gilson, *History*, pp. 55 ff.

In Book VI of In Hierarchiam Hugh took Denys' description of the nature and function of the Seraphim as the pretext for a "wonderful outpouring on the nature of the love of God."[1] There Hugh developed various images including the liquefying power of divine love, the permeation of iron by fire, and the boiling of water in a vessel which would reappear in the works of Richard of St. Victor.[2] The liquefaction theme was directly related to the Ark treatise, for it was the penetrating power of the liquid which dominated both instances.[3] The permeation of iron by fire recalls the "pure flame" of contemplation in the Homily on Ecclesiastes, where all is consumed by the fire of love (ignem amoris), and "God is known truly to be all in all."[4]

In the Homily Hugh called thinking, meditating, and contemplating "the rational soul's three ways of seeing."[5] He then offered the most general definition of their different functions:

---

[1] Kirschberger, Richard of Saint-Victor, p. 49.

[2] Cf. IHC, VI, MPL 175:1038-1044.

[3] The liquefaction, or fusion, of the soul in contemplative excessus is found in St. Bernard, De diligendo Deo, X, 28, MPL 182:991BC; cited, Gilson, History, p. 165. The images of iron liquefied by fire and air flooded by light were taken by Bernard from Maximus the Confessor, Ambigua, II, MPL 122:1202; cf. Gilson, The Mystical Theology of St. Bernard, pp. 25 ff. On the correct interpretation of this permeation and fusion until God is in all without pantheistic assumptions. cf. Gilson, History, pp. 120 f. (on Erigenia) and 165 f. (on Bernard), and idem, Myst. Theol. St. Bern., pp. 25 ff. Hugh of St. Victor uses the liquefaction metaphor along with the consuming power of the pure flame to indicate the same total union, with distinction. Cf. next note.

[4] MPL 175:117B, Sq., p. 184.

[5] Ibid., 116D, p. 183.

> Thinking occurs when the mind becomes aware of things passing through it, when the image of some real thing, entering through the senses or rising up out of the memory, is suddenly presented to it.
>
> Meditation is the concentrated and judicious reconsideration of thought, that tries to unravel something complicated or scrutinizes something obscure to get at the truth of it.
>
> Contemplation is the piercing and spontaneous intuition of the soul, which embraces every aspect of the objects of understanding.[1]

Attempts have been made to associate these three mental functions with the "three eyes" in Hugh's thought.[2] This is an error. The three eyes have to do with three levels of ontological reality, i.e. the visible world, the invisible world of mental and spiritual realities, and God. Thinking, meditating, and contemplation are defined not by their objects but by their operations.[3]

Contemplation was a word of many nuances for Hugh.[4] Briefly the uses may be distinguished as follows: (1) The experience, immediate and innate, of the presence of God by the first man;[5] (2) the *visio Dei* of the saints in heaven;[1] (3) an all-embracing comprehension and grasp of the soul, in contrast to meditation and thinking;[2] (4) the "contemplative experience" in this life;[3] and (5) the "consideration of created things" which also was associated with meditatio and speculatio.[4] The "eye of contemplation" may be associated with (1) above.[5] In distinguishing contemplation and the sacrament of faith, Hugh had in mind contemplation construed as the visio Dei.[6]

---

[1] MPL 175:116D, Sq., p. 183.

[2] Cf. the refs. in Kleinz, *Theory of Knowledge*, p. 120, n. 43, and Ebner, *Die Erkenntnislehre*, pp. 92 f. Typical is that of the art. "Hugh of St. Victor," *The Columbia Encyclopedia* (New York, 1940), p. 858: "Hugh was responsible for the celebrated division of the mystical ascent into three stages: thought (with which we see God in nature); meditation (with which we see God within ourselves); and contemplation (with which we see God face to face)." Quoted via Kleinz, p. 120, n. 43.

[3] Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 121 f.; also Ostler, *Die Psychologie*, p. 146, and Ebner, *Die Erkenntnislehre*, pp. 93 ff.

[4] Cf. Baron, *Sci. et Sg.*, p. 192, n. 101. For reasons stated earlier, we have not repeated any of his definitions drawn from *De contempl*.

[5] Cf. *A. morl.*, I, 2; IV, 10; MPL 176:619/20 and 671A, Sq., pp. 46 and 135.; also, *DS*, I, vi, 14, MPL 176:271CD, Def., p. 103.

Contemplation, like compunction, forms both an end and a new beginning. With the reformation of the image of God, the mirror of contemplation, within the soul of man the unitive life begins. For Hugh this last stage in the journey of man's restoration is a gradual growth in virtue. This growth was symbolized in the Ark drawing through personifications of three of the cardinal virtues: Moderation (temperantia), prudence (prudentia), and endurance (fortitudo).[7] Associated iconographical motifs and parallel patterns establish several relationships with these virtues. First, they form not only a progression of virtues but they also represent an hierarchical rank of believers within the Church: The married, the continent, and the virgins (*conjugali*, *continentes*, *virgines*).[1] Or, expressed in another manner, they represent those who use the world lawfully, flee the world, or have left the world behind (*utentes mundi*, *fugientes mundum*, *obliti mundum*).[2] This hierarchy of estates, ranging from the laity to the monastics, was set clearly within the Church and indicated no special prerogative, spiritually, for any group. Hugh considered contemplation an experience open to all.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Ibid., III, 14 and 15, 661D-662B, Sq., p. 119. Baron's reference to A. morl., IV, 15, MPL 176:682 corresponds to neither chapter number nor column number for the treatise.

[2] Cf. In Eccl. homil., I, MPL 175:116D, Sq., p. 183.

[3] Cf. ibid., 118, pp. 184 f.

[4] For contemplatio, cf. A. morl., II, 5, MPL 176:637C f., Sq., pp. 77 f., and Hom. in Eccl., I, MPL 175:117B, Sq., p. 184. For speculatio, cf. ibid., 118BC, pp. 185 ff. For meditatio in an equivalent use, cf. Did., III, 10, Butt., pp. 59 f., Tay., pp. 92 f.

[5] Cf. the discussion of the three eyes, supra, chap. III.

[6] Cf. DS, I, x, 9, MPL 176:342D, Def., p. 181. "Faith, then, is the sacrament of future contemplation, . . ."

[7] Cf. A. myst., X, MPL 176:697D.

The iconography of the last two virtues is of some significance at this point. The second virtue, prudence, was depicted as a pilgrim (*perigrinus*) wandering about as if he would flee the world.[4] The conception of pilgrimage in the contemplative quest was of ancient use. It also possessed a long association with the monastic life.[5] In this connection it had several uses. Early it meant missionary activity undertaken by a monk, as an exile from his country and a seeking of the heavenly fatherland.

---

[1] Cf. *A. myst.*, X, MPL 176:697BC. [2] *Ibid.*

[3] Cf. Baron, *Sci. et Sg.*, p. 170, n. 20 who comments that in this Hugh follows Gregory the Great and differs with Cassian. For Gregory, cf. Butler, *Western Mysticism*, pp. 186 ff.

[4] *A. myst.*, X, MPL 176:697B.

[5] For the various uses of the concept of exile and pilgrimage in the monastic tradition, cf. J. Leclercq, *Aux sources de la spiritualité occidentale* (Paris, 1964), chap. III, "Monachisme et pérégrination." Cf. also Leclercq, *et al*, *La spiritualité*, pp. 57 ff.

Later it came to mean the monastic vocation itself as well as the interior pilgrimage of contemplation.

The last ladder reveals something of significance with respect to Hugh's relationship to pseudo-Dionysius and to the latter's expressions of the "darkness" of the experience of God and the union with God through "unknowing."[1] For Denys, the figure of Moses ascending the mountain and entering into the cloud symbolized the final level of man's quest for spiritual knowledge. It was the culmination of the negative way, the way of "unknowing."[2] For Hugh, as for Richard of St. Victor, the cloud into which Moses ascends is not so much a darkness surrounding God as it is a veil which now stands between the contemplative and the desires and objects of the material world.[3] The cloud is the obliteration of the world. In his description of the mystic experience Hugh remained in the tradition of Augustine and Gregory, for he used metaphors of light and fire.[4]

---

[1] On the importance of this cf. Kirchberger, Richard of Saint-Victor, p. 50.

[2] On this theme, cf. Lossky, The Mystical Theology, chap. II.

[3] Cf. A. myst., X, MPL 176:697B, where the figure of fortitude is covered by a cloud from the waist down; cf. A. morl., III, 7, MPL 176: 654AC, Sq., pp. 105 ff., where the same idea is implicit.

[4] Cf. Baron, ed., De contemplatione, p. 131, n. 124: "The theme of darkness which is associated with Denys . . . has not been retained by the mysticism of Hugh, who rejoins that of Gregory." Cf. Butler, Western Mysticism, pp. 123 ff., for a discussion of the introduction of the theme of darkness by Denys and the theme of light in the "Western" pre-Dionysian tradition.

At the end of his career, as revealed in the Homilies on Ecclesiastes and De arrha animae, we see Hugh of St. Victor as a doctor ecstaticus.[1] His language has become a hymn of rapture to love. Yet the remote foundation of these later treatises lies in the two works which we have been considering. In them the major lines of Hugh's contemplative thought were sketched out and the major themes given voice, however timidly and briefly at that point.

It only remains now to point to the telos toward which the contemplative life tended. It was none other than the eschatological Day of Judgment and the full manifestation of the reunion of all in the unity with God.[2] Here history and contemplation meet in the fulfillment of the purpose of history and of the longing of the contemplative as the church is united in the presence of her Creator and Redeemer. What the contemplative has only experienced as a foretaste is now completed in the full glory of the visio Dei. History, as the purposive dispensation of the divine will in time, has now been brought to a conclusion with the full accomplishment of man's restoration and the completion of the divine purpose in the world. As the blessed go up to meet their King, Hugh sees the procession of the earthly liturgy, reflecting the procession of the Hebrews to the holy mountain of Zion, transformed and transferred into a new key. A vision of the heavenly liturgy opens out before him. In vivid, barely restrained language Hugh paints the picture of that day, in which the doors of the heavenly city, Jerusalem, will be opened for the thronging crowds singing praises of Alleluia with martyrs in their rose-red garments, virgins in their white, and confessors in purple:

---

[1] Squire, SSW, p. 41. R. Javelet, "L'extase chez les spirituels du XII^{e} siècle," Dict. de Spir., IV, ii, 2116, contends that the evidence is stronger for Hugh having experienced the summit of the contemplative experience in ecstasy than for Richard to have achieved it.

[2] Cf. A. morl., I, 15, MPL 176:632D-633A, Sq., p. 69: "When, therefore 'this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality', . . . When our bodily senses are themselves converted into reason, and reason into understanding, then understanding will pass over into God, to whom we shall be united through the one Mediator between God and men, the Lord Jesus Christ."

> Let us, the tribes of Israel, go up with joy to the feast of our heavenly fatherland, to praise the name of the Lord amid the towers of Jerusalem. Let us lift our eyes to see the bright paths strewn along the flanks of the eternal mountains and the footpaths that lead upwards to the gates of Jerusalem. There, on the summit, the standard of the cross, shining with rosy light, makes foes afraid and comforts friends. The doors of the city are open, and in its broad places are the voices of them that sing Alleluia. You will see many people going up thither, dressed in their best, people out of every kindred and nation and tongue, some resplendent in rose-red garments, others bright in white apparel, others again brilliant in purple-scarlet. Everyone is in festal garb. A vast and uncountable people it is that has been made ready for the Day of the Lord.
>
> Up there is the King Himself, and He invites us. He is down here too, and He helps us .... Of every age, both men and women, and every estate of life, they run from all parts of the world, and go up eagerly with speed and joy to see the King in His beauty. Each and all they long to appear with gladness on the day of so great a celebration.[1]

It is for this end that all of the *opera Dei* have taken place: The work of creation, the work of restoration, the work of the liturgy, and the work of reforming man's soul in *imago* by the pure, consuming fire of divine love.

---

[1] *A. morl.*, II, 9, MPL 176:641D-642A, Sq., p. 84 f.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Works

Abelard, Peter. *Opera omnia*. MPL 178.

Adam of St. Victor. *The Liturgical Poetry of Adam of St. Victor. From the Text of Gautier*. Translated with notes by D. S. Wrangham. 3 vols. London, 1881.

Augustine of Hippo. *Christian Instruction (De doctrina Christiana)*. Translated by John J. Gavigan. In vol. II of *The Fathers of the Church*. New York, 1950. Pp. 1-235.

________. *The City of God*. Translated by M. Dods with an introduction by Thomas Merton. New York, 1950.

________. *The First Catechetical Instruction (De Catechizandis Rudibus)*. Translated and annotated by J. P. Christopher. No. 2 of *Ancient Christian Writers*. Edited by J. Quasten and J. C. Plumpe. London, 1962.

________. *Opera omnia*. MPL 32-47.

Baron, R. (ed.) "Hugonis de Sancto Victore *Epitome Dindimi in philosophiam*: introduction, texte critique et notes," *Traditio*, XI (1955), 91-148.

________. (ed.) "Hugonis de Sancto Victore *Practica geometriae*: introduction, texte," *Osiris*, XII (1956), 176-224.

________. "Rapports entre saint Augustin et Hugues de Saint-Victor: trois opuscules de Hugues de Saint-Victor," *Revue des études Augustiniennes*, IV (1959), 391-429.

________. (trans.) *Textes spirituels de Hugues de Saint-Victor*. Tournai, 1962.

________. (ed.) "Textes spirituels inédits de Hugues de Saint-Victor," *Mélanges Science religieuse*, XIII (1956), 157-78.

Bede the Venerable. *Opera omnia*. MPL.

Bernard of Clairvaux. *Opera omnia*. MPL 182-185.

Bliemetzrieder, F. *Anselms von Laon Systematisches Sentenzen* ("Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters," Vol. XVIII, 2/3.) Münster, 1919.

Bonaventura. *Opera omnia*. 11 vols. Quaracchi, 1882-1902.

Bourke, V. J. (ed.). *The Essential Augustine*. New York, 1964.

Cassian, John. *Conférences*. Introduction, texte latin, traduction et notes par Dom E. Pichery. 3 vols. Vols. XLII, LIV, and LXIV of *Sources chrétiennes*. Paris, 1955-1959.

Delhaye, P. *Le Microcosmus de Godefroy de Saint-Victor, étude théologique*. Lille, 1951.

Dionysius the Areopagite, Pseudo. *Dionysiaca: Recueil donnant l'ensemble des traductions latines des ouvrages attribués au Denys de L'Areopage*. 2 vols. Edited by Ph. Chevallier *et al*. Paris, 1937.

________. *Dionysius the Areopagite on the Divine Names and the Mystical Theology*. Translated with an introduction by C. E. Rolt. London, 1920.

________. *La hierarchie celeste*. Vol. LVIII of *Sources chrétiennes*. Paris, 1958.

________. *Oeuvres complètes du Pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite*. Translated by M. de Gandillac. Paris, 1943.

________. *The Works of Dionysius the Areopagite*. Translated by John Parker. London, 1897.

Fairweather, E. R. (ed. and trans.). *A Scholastic Miscellany: Anselm to Ockham*. Vol. X of *The Library of Christian Classics*. Philadelphia, 1956.

Glossa ordinaria. MPL 113-114.

Godefroy de Saint-Victor. *Microcosmus*. Texte établi et présenté par Philippe Delhaye. Lille, 1951.

Green, W. M. "Hugo of St. Victor: De tribus maximis circumstantiis gestorum," *Speculum*, XVIII (1943), 484-93.

Gregory the Great. *Morales sur Job*. Edited and translated by R. Gillet. Vol. XXXII of *Sources chretiénnes*. Paris, 1952.

________. *Opera omnia*. MPL 75-79.

Guy, J.-C. *Jean Cassien: Vie et doctrine spirituelle* ("Théologie, pastorale et spiritualité," Recherches et synthèses, Vol. IX. Paris, 1961.

Honorius of Autun. *Opera omnia*. MPL 172.

Hugh of St. Victor. *Chronica quae dicitur Hugonis de Sancto Victore*. Edited by G. Waitz. In *Monumenta Germaniae historica*, Scriptores XXIV, 88-97.

________. *La contemplation et ses especes*. Introduction, texte et notes par Roger Baron. ("Monumenta Christiana Selecta," Vol. II.) Tournai, 1955.

________. *Didascalicon: De Studio Legendi*. A critical text by Charles Henry Buttimer. ("The Catholic University of America Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin," Vol. X.) Washington, D. C., 1939.

________. *The Divine Love: The two treatises "De Laude Caritatis" and "De Amore Sponsi ad Sponsam."* Translated by a Religious of C.S.M.V. London, 1956.

________. *Le gage des divine financailles("De arrha animae")*. Translated by M. Ledrus. ("Museum Lessianum," Section ascetique et mystique, Vol. XII.) Louvain, 1923.

________. *On the Sacraments of the Christian Faith (De sacramentis)*. Translated by Roy J. Deferrari ("Publications of the Mediaeval Society of America," No. 58.) Cambridge, Mass., 1951.

________. *Opera omnia*. MPL 175-177.

________. *Opera propaedeutica: Practica geometriae, De grammatica, Epitome Dindimi in philosophiam*. Edited by Roger Baron. ("University of Notre Dame: Publications in Mediaeval Studies," Vol. XX.) Notre Dame, 1966.

________. *Selected Spiritual Writings*. Translated by a Religious of C.S.M.V., with an introduction by Aelred Squire. London, 1962.

________. *"Soliloquium de arrha animae" und "De vanitate mundi."* Edited by K. Müller. ("Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen," No. 123.) Bonn, 1913.

________. *Soliloquy on the Earnest Money of the Soul*. Translated from the Latin with an Introduction by Kevin Herbert. ("Mediaeval Philosophical Texts in Translation," No. 9.) Milwaukee, Wisc., 1956.

________. *The Soul's Betrothal-Gift*. Translated by F. Sherwood Taylor. Westminster, Eng., 1945.

Isidore of Seville. *Etymologiae*, MPL 82:73-728.

Jerome. *Opera omnia*. MPL 22-30.

Leclercq, J. (ed.). "Le 'De grammatica' de Hugues de Saint-Victor," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, XV (1943-1945), 263-322.

McCracken, G. E. (ed.). *Early Medieval Theology*. Vol. IX of *The Library of Christian Classics*. Philadelphia, 1957.

Mierow, C. H. (trans.). *The Two Cities: A Chronicle of Universal History to the Year 1146 AD, by Otto Bishop of Freising*. New York, 1928.

Martené, Edmundo. *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*. 4 vols. Bassani, 1788.

Migne, J.-P. *Patrologia Latina Cursus Completus*. 221 vols. Paris, 1844-64.

Origen. *On First Principles*. Translated with introduction and notes by G. W. Butterworth. London, 1936.

________. *The Song of Songs: Commentary and Homilies*. Translated and annotated by R. P. Lawson. No. 26 of *Ancient Christian Writers*. Edited by J. Quasten and J. C. Plumpe. London, 1957.

Panofsky, E. *Abbot Suger on the Abbey Church of St. Denis and Its Art Treasures*. Edited, translated and annotated. Princeton, 1946.

Petry, R. C. (ed.). *Late Medieval Mysticism*. Vol. XIII of *The Library of Christian Classics*. Philadelphia, 1957.

Raban Maur. *Opera omnia*. MPL 107-112.

Richard de Saint-Victor. *Liber exceptionum*. Texte critique avec introduction, notes et tables, by J. Chatillon. Paris, 1958.

________. *Opera omnia*. MPL 196.

________. *Selected Writings on Contemplation*. Translated with an introduction by Clare Kirschberger. London, 1957.

________. *Sermons et opuscules spirituels inedits*. Vol I: *L'édit d'Alexandre ou Les trois Processions*. Edited with introduction and notes by J. Chatillon, W.-J. Tulloch, and J. Barthélemy. Bruges, 1951.

Straub, A. and G. Keller. *Herrade de Landsberg: Hortus Deliciarum*. Strassbourg, 1901.

Taylor, J. *The "Didascalicon" of Hugh of St. Victor: A Medieval Guide to the Arts*. Translated from the Latin with an Introduction and Notes. ("Records of Civilization: Sources and Studies," No. LXIV.) New York, 1961.

Wilmart, A. "Opuscules choisis de Hugues de Saint-Victor," *Revue Bénédictine*, XLIII (1933), 242-48.

Wolff, P. (ed.). *Die Viktoriner: Mystische Schriften*. Vienna, 1936.

Secondary Works

Allen, Dom. C. *The Legend of Noah: Renaissance Rationalism in Art, Science, and Letters*. Urbana, Ill., 1963.

Allers, P. "Microcosmus from Anaximandros to Paracelsus," *Traditio*, II (1944), 318-407.

d'Alverny, M.-Th. "Le Cosmos symbolique du XII^{e} siècle," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, XX (1953), 31-81.

Andrieu, M. *Le Pontifical romain au XII^{e} siècle*. Vol. I of *Le Pontifical romain au moyen-âge*. Vatican City, 1938.

Baltus, U. "Dieu d'après Hugues de Saint-Victor," *Revue bénédictine*, XV (1898), 109-23, 200-14.

Baron, R. "Hugues de Saint-Victor: Contribution à un nouvel examen de son oeuvre," *Traditio*, XV (1959), 223-97.

________. "L'Esthétique de Hugues de Saint-Victor," *Actes de IX^{e} Congres des Societes de Philosophie de Langue Francaise*. Aix-en-Provence, 1957.

________. "Étude sur l'authenticité de l'oeuvre de Hugues de Saint-Victor d'après les mss Paris Maz. 717, BN 14506 et Douai 360-366," *Scriptorium*, X (1956), 182-220.

________. "Hugues de Saint-Victor est-il l'auteur d'un commentaire de la Regle de saint Augustin," *Recherches sciences religieuses*, XLIII (1955), 342-60.

________. "Hugues de Saint-Victor lexicographe," *Cultura néolatina*, XVI (1956), 109-45.

________. *Hugues et Richard de Saint-Victor*. Paris, 1962.

________. "L'influence de Hugues de Saint-Victor," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*. XXII (1955), 56-71.

Baron, R. "Notes biographiques sur Hugues de St.-Victor," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*. LI (1956), 920-934.

________. "Note sur l'énigmatique 'Summa Sententiarum'," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, XXV (1958), 26-41.

________. "Note sur la succession et la date des écrits de Hugues de Saint-Victor," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, LVII (1962), 88-118.

________. "La pensée mariale de Hugues de Saint-Victor," *Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique*, XXXI (1955), 249-71.

________. "A propos des ramifications des vertus au XII^{e} siècle," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, XXIII (1956), 19-36.

________. "Richard de Saint-Victor est il l'auteur des commentaires de Nahum, Joël et Abidias," *Revue bénédictine*, LXVIII (1958), 119-22.

________. *Science et Sagesse chez Hugues de Saint-Victor*. Paris, 1957.

________. "La situation de l'homme d'apres Hugues de Saint-Victor," *L'Homme et son destin: Actes du premier Congres Internationale de Philosophie Médiévale (1958)*. Paris, 1960.

Batiffol., P. *History of the Roman Breviary*. Translated by A. M. Y. Baylay. 3rd edition. London, 1912.

Battles, F. L. "Hugo of Saint-Victor as a Moral Allegorist," *Church History*, XVIII (1949), 220-40.

Beckwith, J. *Early Medieval Art*. New York, 1964.

Berlière, U. *L'ascèse bénédictine des origines à la fin du XII^{e} siècle*. Paris, 1927.

________. *L'ordre monastique des origines au XII^{e} siècle*. 3d ed. revised. Paris, 1924.

Bett, H. *Johannes Scotus Erigena: A Study in Mediaeval Philosophy*. Cambridge, 1925.

Bischoff, B. "Aus der Schule Hugos von St. Viktor." *Aus der Geisteswelt des Mittelalters*. ("Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters," Suppl. III, 1.) Münster, 1935. Pp. 246-50.

Blaise, A. *Dictionnaire Latin-Francais des auteurs chrétiens*. Turnhout, 1962 .

Boeckler, A. *Die Regensburg-Prüfeninger Buchmalerei des XII. und XIII. Jahrhunderts* ("Miniaturen aus Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek in München," Vol. VIII.) München, 1924.

Bonnard, F. *Histoire de l'Abbaye royale et de l'ordre des chanoines régulier de St-Victor de Paris*. 2 vols. Paris, 1905-1907.

Bourke, V. J. *Augustine's Quest of Wisdom*. Milwaukee, Wis., 1945.

________ (ed.). *The Essential Augustine*. New York, 1964.

Bouyer, L. *La spiritualité de Nouveau Testament et des Pères*. Vol. II of *Histoire de la spiritualité chrétienne*. Edited by L. Bouyer, *et al*. Paris, 1960.

Bréhier, E. *The Philosophy of Plotinus*. Translated by J. Thomas. Chicago, 1958.

Bucciarelli, R. P. "The Sense of History and the Study of Scripture in Hugh of St. Victor." Unpublished Honors Thesis, Harvard University, 1956.

Burnaby, John. *Amor Dei: A Study of the Religion of St. Augustine*. London, 1938.

Butler, C. *Benedictine Monachism*. 2d edition. London, 1924.

________. *Western Mysticism: The Teaching of Augustine, Gregory and Bernard on Contemplation and the Contemplative Life*. 2d ed. with Afterthoughts. London, 1926.

Caplan, H. "The Four Senses of Scriptural Interpretation and the Medieval Theory of Preaching," *Speculum*, IV (1929), 282-90.

Carroll, Sister M. Thomas Aquinas. *The Venerable Bede: His Spiritual Teachings* ("The Catholic University of American Studies in Mediaeval History," New Series, Vol. IX.) Washington, D. C., 1946.

Cayré, F. *Manual of Patrology and History of Theology*. Translated by H. Howitt. 2 vols. Paris, 1936 and 1940.

Cavallera, F. "Le 'De sacramentis' d'Hugues de Saint-Victor. Rapports du Dialogue et du Traité," *Bulletin de Littérature ecclésiastique*, XLI (1940), 207-10.

Chadwick, O. *John Cassian: A Study in Primitive Monasticism*. Cambridge, 1950.

Chatillon, J. "Le Contenu, l'authenticité et la date du Liber exceptionum et des Sermones centum de Richard de Saint-Victor," *Revue du moyen âge latin*, IV (1948), 23-51 and 342-64.

________. "Une ecclésiology médiévale: l'Idée de l'Église dans le théologie de l'école de Saint-Victor au XII^e^ siècle," *Irénikon*, XXII (1949), 115-38 and 395-411.

Chatillon, "De Guillaume de Champeaux à Thomas Gallus: chronique d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale de l'École de Saint-Victor," *Revue du moyen âge latin*, VIII (1952), 139-62, 247-73.

Chenu, M.-D. "La psychologie de la foi dans la théologie du XIII^{e} siècle," *Etudes d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale du XIII^{e} siècle*. Duxième serie. (Paris, 1932), pp. 163-87.

________. *La théologie au douzième siècle* ("Études de philosophie médiévale," Vol. XLV.) Paris, 1957.

________. *La théologie comme science au XIII^{e} siècle* ("Bibliothèque Thomiste," Vol. XXXIII.) Paris, 1957.

________. *Toward Understanding Saint Thomas*. Translated with authorized corrections and bibliographical additions by A.-M. Landry and D. Hughes. Chicago, 1964.

Cherniss, H. F. *The Platonism of Gregory of Nyssa* ("University of California Publications in Classical Philology," Vol. XI, No. 1.) Berkeley, 1930.

Childs, Brevard. *Myth and Reality in the Old Testament* ("Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 27.) London, 1960.

Copleston, F. *A History of Philosophy*. Vol. II: *From Augustine to Scotus*. Westminister, Md., 1950.

Cottiaux, J. "La conception de la théologie chez Abelard," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XXVIII (1932), 247-95, 533-55, and 788-828.

Coutrier, C. "*Sacramentum* et *Mysterium* dans l'oeuvre de saint Augustin," Études Augustiennes ("Théologie," Vol. XXVIII.) Paris, 1953.

Crosby, S. McK. *The Abbey of St.-Denis*. New Haven, 1942.

Crouzel, H. *Origene et la "connaissance mystique"* ("Museum Lessianum," sect. théologique, No. 56.) N.p., 1961.

Croydon, F. E. "Abbot Laurence of Westminster and Hugh of St. Victor," *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies*, II (1950), 169-71.

________. "Notes on the Life of Hugh of St. Victor," *Journal of Theological Studies*, XL (1939), 232-53.

Daniélou, J. *The Bible and the Liturgy*. Notre Dame, Ind., 1956.

________. *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers*. London, 1960.

Daniélou, J. *The Lord of History*. Translated by N. Abercrombie. London, 1958.

________. *Origen*. Translated by Walter Mitchell. London, 1955.

________. *Platonisme et théologie mystique: essai sur la doctrine spirituelle de Saint Grégoire de Nysse* ("Théologie," Vol. II.) Paris, 1944.

Davy, M.-M. *Initiation à la Symbolique Romane (XII^{e} siècle)*. Nouv. edition. Paris, 1964.

De Bruyne, E. *L'esthétique du moyen âge*. Louvain, 1947.

Delhaye, Ph. "*Grammatica* et *Ethica* au XII^{e} siècle," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, XXV (1958), 59-110.

________. *Le Microcosmus de Godefroy de Saint-Victor, étude théologique*. Lille, 1951.

________. "L'organisation scolaire au XII^{e} siècle," *Traditio*, *V* (1947), 211-68.

Dempf, A. *Sacrum Imperium*. *Geschichts und Staatsphilosophie des Mittelalters*. München, 1929.

Dereine, Ch. "Chanoines," *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, XII, 353-405.

________. *Les Chanoines réguliers au diocese de Liege avant Saint Norbert*. Bruxelles, 1952.

Dickinson, J. C. *The Origins of the Austin Canons and their Introduction into England*. London, 1950.

Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie. 15 vols. Edited by F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq. Paris, 1924-1953.

Dictionnaire de spiritualité, ascétique et mystique. 6 vols., in progress. Edited by M. Viller, *et al*. Paris, 1953-.

Dictionnaire de théologie catholique. 15 vols. Edited by A. Vacant, E. Mangenot, and E. Amann. Paris, 1926-1950.

Dondaine, H. F. *Le corpus Dionysien de l'Université de Paris au XIII^{e} siècle*. Rome, 1953.

Dudden, F. Holmes. *Gregory the Great: His Place in History and Thought*. 2 vols. London, 1905.

Dumeige, G. *Richard de Saint-Victor et l'idee chrétienne de l'amour*. Paris, 1952.

Ebner, J. *Die Erkenntnislehre Richards von Saint Viktor* ("Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters," Vol. XIX, 4.) Münster, 1907.

Eliade, M. *Cosmos and History: The Myth of the Eternal Return*. New York, 1959.

________. *Patterns in Comparative Religion*. Translated by Rosemary Sheed. Cleveland, 1953.

________. *The Sacred and the Profane*. Translated by Williard R. Trask. New York, 1961.

Forest, A., F. Van Steenberghen, and M. de Gandillac. *Le mouvement doctrinal du XI^{e} au XIV^{e} siècle*. Vol. XIII of *Histoire de l'Église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours*. Edited by A. Fliche and V. Martin. Paris, 1961.

Franklin, A. *L'histoire de la bibliothéque de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor à Paris*. Paris, 1865.

Gaspar, C. et F. Lyna. *Les principaux manuscrits de la Bibliothèque royale de Belgique*. Paris, 1937.

Gerstinger, H. *Die Wiener Genesis*. Wien, 1931.

Geyer, B. *Die Patristische und Scholastische Philosophie*. Vol. II of *Friedrich Ueberwegs Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*. 11th ed. revised. Berlin, 1928.

de Ghellinck, J. *L'essor de la littérature latine au XII^{e} siècle*. 2 vols. ("Museum Lessianum," Section historique, nos. 4 and 5.) Bruxelles, 1946.

________. *Le mouvement théologique de XII^{e} siècle*. 2nd ed., aug. ("Museum Lessianum," Section historique, n. 10.) Bruges, 1948.

________., E. De Backer, J. Poukens et G. Lebacqz, *Pour l'histoire du mot "Sacramentum"* ("Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense," Vol. III.) Louvain-Paris, 1924.

________. "La table des matières de la première édition des oeuvres de Hugues de Saint-Victor," *Recherches de Sciences Religieuses*, I (1910), 270-89 and 385-96.

Gilson, E. *A History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. New York, 1955.

________. *The Christian Philosophy of St. Augustine*. Translated by L. Lynch. New York, 1950.

________. "Maxime, Érigène, S. Bernard," *Aus der Geisteswelt des Mittelalters* ("Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters," Suppl. III, 1.) Münster, 1935. Pp. 188-195.

Gilson, E. *The Mystical Theology of Saint Bernard*. Translated by A. H. C. Downes. London, 1940.

________. *The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy*. Translated by A. H. C. Downes. New York, 1936.

Grabmann, M. *Die Geschichte der Scholastischen Methode*. 2 vols. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1909.

Guillet, J. "Les exégèses d'Alexandrie ou d'Antioche. Conflit ou malentendu," *Recherches de science religieuse*, XXXIV (1947), 257-302.

Hablitzel, "Hrabanus Maurus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der mittelalterlichen Exegese," *Biblische Studien*, XI, iii heft (1906), 1-105.

Hailperin, H. *Rashi and the Christian Scholars*. Pittsburgh, 1963.

Hanson, R. P. C. *Allegory and Event: A study of the sources and significance of Origen's interpretation of scripture*. London, 1959.

Hardison, O. B. *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages*. Baltimore, Md., 1965.

Hartel, E. R. von and F. Wickhoff. *Die Wiener Genesis*. Wien, 1895.

Haskins, C. H. *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*. Cambridge, Mass., 1927.

Hauréau, B. *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique*. Vol. I. Paris, 1872.

________. *Les oeuvres de Hugues de Saint-Victor: essai critique*. Nouvelle edition. Paris, 1886.

Healy, P. J. "The Mysticism of the School of Saint Victor," *Church History*, I (1932), 211-21.

Heitz, T. *Essai historique sur les rapports entre la philosophie et la foi, de Bérengar de Tours à Thomas d'Aquin*. Paris, 1909.

Hofmeier, J. *Die Trinitätslehre des Hugo von St. Viktor; dargestellt im Zusammenhang mit den trinitarischen Strömungen seiner Zeit* ("Münchener Theologische Studien," II. Syst. abt., Bd. 25.) München, 1963.

Hofmeister, A. "Studien über Otto von Freising," *Neues Archiv*, XXXVI (1912), 99-161 and 635-767.

Hugonin, F. *Essai sur la fondation de l'école de Saint-Victor de Paris*. MPL 175: xv-c.

Ivánka, E. von. *Plato Christianus*. Einsiedeln, 1964.

Jacob, E. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Translated A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock. New York, 1958.

Javelet, R. "Au XII^{e} siècle, l'Écriture sainte servante de la mystique?" *Revue des sciences religieuses*, XXXVII (1963), 345-69.

________. "Les origines de Hugues de Saint-Victor," *Revue des sciences religieuses*, XXXIV (1960), 74-83.

Jonas, H. *The Gnostic Religion*. *The Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity*. 2d ed. revised. Boston, 1963.

Jungmann, J. A. *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development*. Translated by F. A. Brunner. 2 vols. New York, 1951.

Katzenellenbogen, A. *Allegories of the Virtues and Vices in Mediaeval Art*. Translated by A. J. P. Crick. London, 1939.

Kilgenstein, J. *Die Gotteslehre des Hugo von St. Viktor*. Würzburg, 1898.

Kleineidam, E. "Literargeschichtliche Bemerkungen zur Eucharistielehre Hugos von St. Viktor," *Scholastik*, XX-XXIV (1949), 564-66.

Kleinz, J. P. *The Theory of Knowledge of Hugh of Saint Victor* ("The Catholic University of America Philosophical Studies," Vol. LXXXVII.) Washington, D. C., 1944.

Köhler, L. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by A. S. Todd. Philadelphia, 1958.

Köster, H. *Die Heilslehre des Hugo von St. Viktor: Grundlagen und Grundzüge*. Emsdetten, 1940.

Künstle, K. *Ikonographie der christlichen Kunst*. 2 vols. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1928.

Ladner, G. B. *The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers*. Cambridge, Mass., 1959.

Lasić, D. "Hugo de Sancto Victore auctor operis 'De contemplatione et eius specibus'," *Antonianum*, XXVIII (1953), 377-88.

________. *Hugonis de S. Victore Theologia perfectiva: eius fundamentum philosophicum ac theologicum* ("Studia Antoniana," Vol. VII.) Rome, 1956.

Leclercq, J. "Contemplation de vie contemplative du VI^{e} au XII^{e} siècle," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité, ascétique, et mystique*, II, ii, 1929-1948.

________. *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*. Translated by C. Misrahi. New York, 1961.

Leclercq, J. *Aux sources de la spiritualité occidentale: étapes et constantes*. Paris, 1964.

________., F. Vandenbroucke, and L. Bouyer. *La spiritualité du moyen âge*. Vol. II of *Histoire de la spiritualité chrétienne*. Edited by L. Bouyer, *et al*. Paris, 1961.

Liebeschütz, Hans. *Das Allegorische Weltbild der Heiligen Hildegard von Bingen* ("Studien der Bibliothek Warburg," Vol. XVI.) Leipzig-Berlin, 1930.

Liebner, A. *Hugo von St. Victor und die theologischen Richtungen seiner Zeit*. Leipzig, 1832.

Lindblom, J. *Prophecy in Ancient Israel*. Philadelphia, 1962.

Lossky, V. *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. Translated by a small group of members of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Serguis. London, 1957.

Lottin, O. "Nouveaux fragments théologiques de l'école d'Anselme de Laon: Conclusions et tables," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, XIV (1947), 159-65.

________. *Psychologie et Morale au XII^{e} et XIII^{e} siècles*. 6 vols. Louvain, 1942-1960.

________. "Quelques recueils d'écrits attribuees à Hugues de Saint-Victor," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, XXV (1958), 248-84.

Lowrie, W. *Art in the Early Church*. New York, 1947.

de Lubac, H. *Exégèse médiévale: Les quatre sens de l'Écriture*. 2 vols. in 4 ("Théologie," Vols. XLI, XLII, LIX.) Paris, 1959-1962.

________. *Histoire et Ésprit: L'intelligence de l'écriture d'après Origène* ("Théologie," Vol. XXIV.) Paris, 1950.

________. "Sur un vieux distique: La doctrine du 'quadruple sens'," *Mélanges offert au Ferdinand Cavallera*. Toulouse, 1948. Pp. 347-66.

________. "Typologie et allegorisme," *Recherches de science religieuse*, XXXIV (1947), 180 ff.

Luneau, A. *L'Histoire du salut chez les Pères de l'Église: la doctrine des âges du monde* ("Théologie historique," Vol. II.) Paris, 1964.

Mâle, E. *L'Art religieux du XII^{e} siècle en France. Étude sur les origines de l'iconographie du moyen âge*. 3rd ed. rev. and corrected. Paris, 1928.

Mâle, E. *The Gothic Image. Religious Art in France of the Thirteenth Century.* Translated by Dora Nussey. New York, 1958.

Manitius, M. *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters.* 3 vols. München, 1911-1931.

Maréchal, J. *Études sur la Psychologie des Mystiques* ("Museum Lessianum," sect. phil., Nos. 2 [2d ed.] and 19.) Paris, 1938 and 1937.

Marrou, H.-I. *L'amvibalence du temps de l'histoire chez saint Augustin* ("Conference Albert-le-Grand," 1950.) Montreal, 1950.

________. *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique.* 4th edition. Paris, 1949.

Martin, J. R. *The Illustration of the Heavenly Ladder of John Climacus* ("Studies in Manuscript Illumination," Vol. V.) Princeton, 1954.

Mersch, E. *The Theology of the Mystical Body.* Translated by C. Vollert. St. Louis, 1952.

Mierow, C. C. "A Description of Manuscript Garret Deposit 1450, Princeton University Library, Together with a Collation of the First Work Contained in It, the De Arca Noe of Hugo de Sancto Victore," *Transactions of the American Library Institute, for 1917.* Chicago, 1918.

Mignon, A. *Les Origines de la scholastique et Hugues de Saint-Victor.* 2 vols. Paris, 1895.

Moore, P. S. *The Works of Peter of Poitiers.* Georgetown, 1936.

Müller, K. "Zur Mystik Hugos von St. Victor," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XLV (1926), 175-89.

Olphe-Galliard, M. "Cassien," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité, ascétique,* et mystique, II, i, 214-76.

Ostler, H. *Die Psychologie des Hugo von St. Viktor* ("Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters," Vol. VI, 1.) Münster, 1906.

Ott, L. "Hugo von St. Viktor und die Kirchenväter," *Divus Thomas* (Fribourg), III, 27 (1949), 180-200 and 293-332.

________. *Untersuchungen zur theologischen Briefliteratur der Frühscholastik unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Viktorinerkreises* ("Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters," Vol. XXXIV), Münster, 1935.

Overton, J. H. "The Fifth and Sixth Degrees of Contemplation Studied in the Context of the Liturgical Community from Some Newly Edited Texts of Richard of St. Victor." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Duke University, 1958.

Pächt, O. and J. J. G. Alexander. *Illuminated Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library Oxford*. I: German, Dutch, Flemish, French and Spanish Schools. Oxford, 1966.

Paré, G., Brunet, A., and Tremblay, P. *La renaissance du XII^{e} siècle: les écoles et l'enseignement* ("Publications de l'Institut d'Études Médiévales d'Ottawa," Vol. III.) Paris-Ottawa, 1933.

Pedersen, J. "Recherche de la sagesse d'après Hugues de Saint-Victor," *Classica et mediaevalia* XVI (1955), 91-133.

Petry, R. C. *Christian Eschatology and Social Thought*. New York, 1956.

________. "Three Medieval Chroniclers: Monastic Historiography and Biblical Eschatology in Hugh of St. Victor, Otto of Freising, and Ordericus Vitalis," *Church History*, XXXIV (1963), 282-293.

Pollitt, H. P. "Hugh of St. Victor as Biblical Exegete." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Sheffield, Eng., 1960.

Poppenberg, E. *Die Christologie des Hugo von St. Viktor*. Hilltrup, 1937.

Portalié, E. *A Guide to the Thought of Saint Augustine*. Translated by R. J. Bastian. Chicago, 1960.

Pourrat, P. *La spiritualité chrétienne*. 4 vols. Paris, 1918-1928.

Quaesten, J. *Patrology*. 3 vols. Westminster, Md., 1950-1960.

Rad, G. von. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated D. M. G. Stalker. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1965.

Rahner, Hugo. *Greek Myths and Christian Mystery*. Translated by Brian Battershaw. New York, 1963.

Rand, E. K. *Founders of the Middle Ages*. Cambridge, Mass., 1928.

Rashdall, H. *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*. New edition by F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden. Oxford, 1936.

Reau, L. *Iconographie de l'Art chrétien*. 6 vols. Paris, 1955.

Robilliard, J. A. "Hughes de Saint-Victor a-t-il écrit le 'De contemplatione et eius speciebus'," *Revue des Sciences Philosophies et Théologiques*, XXXXIII (1959), 621-31.

Robson, C. A. *Maurice of Sully*. Oxford, 1952.

Robson, C. A. "The *Pecia* of the Twelfth-Century Paris School," *Dominican Studies*, II (1949), 262-79.

Rogers, E. *Peter Lombard and the Sacramental System*. New York, 1917.

Roques, R. *Structures théologiques de la gnose à Richard de Saint-Victor* ("Bibliothèque de L'École des Hautes Études," Section des sciences religieuses, vol. LXXII.) Paris, 1962.

_______. *L'univers dionysien. Structure hiérarchique du monde selon le pseudo-Denys* ("Théologie," Vol. XXIX.) Paris, 1954.

Rousselot, P. *Pour l'histoire du probleme de l'amour au moyen âge* ("Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters," Vol. VI, 6.) Münster, 1908.

Rutledge, D. *Cosmic Theology*. London, 1964.

Sanford, E. M. "Honorius, *Presbyter* and *Scholasticus*," *Speculum*, XXIII (1948), 397-425.

Sauer, J. *Symbolik des Kirchengebäudes und seiner Ausstattung in der Auffassung des Mittelalters*. 2d edition. Münster, 1964.

Schlette, H. R. "Die Eucharistielehre Hugos von St. Viktor," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, LXXXI (1959), 67-100 and 163-210.

_______. *Die Nichtigkeit der Welt: Der philosophische Horizont des Hugo von St. Viktor*. München, 1961.

Schmaus, M. *Die psychologische Trinitätslehre des hl. Augustinus* ("Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie," Heft 11.) Münster, 1927.

Schneider, W. A. *Geschichte und Geschichtsphilosophie bei Hugo von St. Victor: Ein Beiträg zur Geistesgeschichte des 12. Jahrhunderts* ("Münstersche Beiträge zur Geschichtsforschung," III. Folge, ii. Heft.) Münster, 1933.

Schneyer, J. G. "Ergänzungen der Sermones und Miscellanea des Hugo von Sankt Viktor aus verschiedenen Handschriften," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, XXXI (1964), 260-86.

Sheridan, P. *Philosophy and Erudition in the Didascalicon of Hugh of Saint Victor*. Fribourg, Switzerland, 1962.

Simson, O. von. *The Gothic Cathedral: Origins of Gothic Architecture and the Medieval Concept of Order*. 2d ed. revised. New York, 1962.

Singer, C. "The Scientific Views and Visions of Saint Hildegard (1098-1180)," *Studies in the History and Method of Science*. Edited by C. Singer. Oxford, 1917.

Smalley, B. "Stephen Langton and the Four Senses of Scripture," *Speculum*, VI (1931), 60-76.

________. *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. 2d ed. revised. Oxford, 1952.

Smith, Margaret. *An Introduction to the History of Mysticism*. London, 1930.

Southern, R. W. *The Making of the Middle Ages*. New Haven, Conn., 1953.

Spicq, C. "Le Canon des Livres Saints au XIII^{e} siècle," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, XXXI (1942), 426-38.

________. *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au moyen âge* ("Bibliothèque Thomsiste," Vol. XXVI.) Paris, 1944.

________. "Pourquoi le Moyen-Age n'a-t-il pas davantage pratique l'exégèse litterale?" *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, XXX (1941-1942), 169-79.

Spörl, J. *Grundformen hochmittelaltericher Geschichtsanschauung*. München, 1935.

Squire, A. "Aelred of Rievaulx and Hugh of St. Victor," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, XXVIII (1961), 161-64.

Taylor, J. *The Origin and Early Life of Hugh of St. Victor: An Evaluation of the Tradition* ("Texts and Studies in the History of Mediaeval Education," No. V.) Notre Dame, 1957.

Thompson, A. H., ed. *Bede, His Life, Times, and Writings*. Oxford, 1935.

Underhill, E. *Mysticism: A Study in the nature and development of Man's spiritual consciousness*. Cleveland, 1955.

Van den Eynde, D. "Deux traités faussement attribués à Hugues de Saint-Victor," *Franciscan Studies*, XIX (1959), 318-24.

________. *Essai sur la succession et la date des écrits de Hugues de Saint-Victor* ("Spicilegium Pontificii Athenaei Antoniana," Vol. XIII.) Rome, 1960.

Van Unnik, W. C. *Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings*. Translated by H. Hoskins ("Studies in Biblical Theology," No. 41.) London, 1960.

Vernet, F. "Hugues de Saint-Victor," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, VII, i, 204-308.

________. *La spiritualité médiévale*. Paris, 1929.

Völker, W. *Das Vollkommenheitsideal des Origenes*. Tübingen, 1931.

Wasselynck, R. "Les compilations des 'Moralia in Job' du VII^{e} au XII^{e} siècle," Recherches théologie ancienne et médiévale, XXIX (1962), 5-32.

________. "L'Influence des *Moralia in Job* de S. Grégoire le Grand sur la théologie morale entre le VII^{e} et le XII^{e} siècle." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Lille, Faculté de théologie, 1956.

________. "La part des 'Moralia in Job' de S. Grégoire-le-Grand dans les 'Miscellanea' Victorins," *Mélanges de science religieuse*, X (1953), 286-94.

Webster, J. C. *The Labors of the Months in Antique and Mediaeval Art* ("Northwestern University Studies in the Humanities," No. 4.) Evanston, Ill., 1938.

Weisweiler, H. "Die Arbeitsmethode Hugos von St. Viktor. Ein Beiträg zum Entstehen seines Hauptwerkes De sacramentis," *Scholastik*, XX-XXIV (1949), 256-66.

________. "L'École d'Anselme de Laon et de Guillaume de Champeaux: Nouveaux Documents," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, IV (1932), 237-69 and 371-92.

________. "Zur Einflussphäre der *Vorlesungen* Hugos von St. Viktor," *Melanges Joseph de Ghellinck, S. J.* Vol. II ("Museum Lessianum," Section historique, No. 14.) Gembloux, 1951. Pp. 527-81.

________. "Hugos von St. Viktor 'Dialogus de sacramentis legis naturalis et scriptae' als fruhscholastiches Quellenwerk," *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*. Vol. II ("Studi e Testi," No. 122.) Citta del Vaticano, 1946. Pp. 179-219.

________. "Sacramentum fidei. Augustinische und ps.-dionysische Gedanken in der Glaubenauffassung Hugos von St. Viktor," *Theologie in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Edited by J. Auer and H. Volk. München, 1957. Pp. 433-56.

________. *Das Schrifttum der Schule Anselms von Laon und Wilhelms von Champeaux in deutschen Bibliotheken* ("Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters," Vol. XXXIII, 1-2.) München, 1936.

________. *Die Wirksamkeit der Sakramente nach Hugo von St. Viktor*. Freiburg, 1932.

Wellesz, E. *The Vienna Genesis*. New York, 1960.

Williams, W. *Saint Bernard of Clairvaux* ("Publications of the University of Manchester," Historical series No. LXIX.) Manchester, 1935.

Wilmart, A. "Arca Noe," *Revue bénédictine*, XXVI (1909), 1-12.

Wilmart, A. "Le Commentaire sur le prophète Nahum attribue à Julien de Tolede," *Bulletin de Litterature Ecclésiastique de Toulouse*, VII-VIII (1922), 253-79.

Wolter, H. *Ordericus Vitalis: ein Beiträg zur kluniazensischen Geschichtsschreibung*. Wiesbaden, 1955.

Wolfson, H. A. *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*. Vol. I: *Faith, Trinity, Incarnation*. 2d rev. edition. Cambridge, Mass., 1964.

de Wulf, M. *History of Mediaeval Philosophy*. Translated by E. C. Messenger. 2 vols. 3d English edition, based on the 6th French edition. London, 1935.

Biographical Sketch

of

Grover A. Zinn, Jr.

Place of Birth: El Dorado, Arkansas.

Date of Birth: June 18, 1937.

Education:
Rice University, 1955-1959;
B.A. degree, 1959.
The Divinity School, Duke University, 1959-1962;
B.D. degree, 1962.
The University of Glasgow, Scotland;
Special student, 1962-1963.
Duke University, 1963-1966;
Candidate for the Ph.D. degree, 1969.

Experience:
Assistant minister, the Barony of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland; 1962-1963.

Housemaster, Men's Graduate Center, Duke University; 1963-1965.

Instructor in Religion, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio; 1966 to present.

Awards and Fellowships:
Duke University Graduate Scholarship, 1964-1965.
Duke University Summer Scholar, 1965.
Dempster Fellowship, 1965-1966.